LIBRARY

ONTARIO

DEPARTMENT OF MINES

PUBLISHERS — LAW BOOKS
PRINTERS AND BOOKBINDERS
The Carswell Company

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

1897

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

———•———

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

———•———

Volume XXXII

FRIDAY, MARCH 16TH, 1951.

———•———

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: As I have said on many occasions, we are always delighted to have students from the various schools in the city and its environs attend the session. There do arrive occasions, perhaps, when some particular notice should be given to some students who appear, particularly when they come from a distance.

Today we have a group of students from the Huntsville school, which, I think, represents about as great a distance as any group has travelled to attend a session of this House for a long time.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: We have students from the Mitchell High School, from the Prince of Wales High School and the Seventh Street School in New Toronto.

Presenting of petitions.

Reading and receiving of petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the Day.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr.Speaker, I have here a message from the Lieutenant Governor, signed by his own hand.

The Lieutenant Governor transmits Supplementary Estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending 31st March, 1951, and recommends them to the Assembly. Toronto, March 12, 1951.

This is a Supplementary Estimate relating to the payment on a formula which I shall mention later in the

day of about one and one half million dollars to hospitals in the province of Ontario before the 31st of this month.

The treasury officials advised me today that it was advisable that this should be passed today in order that the cheques may be made to the various hospitals and the amounts of the cheques computed; so that, I will follow the order of things as outlined last night. We will proceed with the Bills which were mentioned and then I would like to take up this Supplementary Estimate and thereafter one or two other minor estimates which we can take, which will fill in the balance of the afternoon, and leave the matter of the Estimates of the Department of Education over to a later date.

I may say, I was interested in the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) stating last night that we always put on Estimates of the Board of Education at night. I just looked the Journals of the House up and I find that last year on March 31 they came up between 2:00 o'clock and 4:35 o'clock on that afternoon; and on the 5th April they came up between 8:00 and 10:30. I think that was a pretty fair place to bring on the Estimates of this Department. I just point that out, and say that sometimes late at night there are things engendered which really are not in accordance with the actual facts at all.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) recalls 5.30 a.m. of the 1949 session?,

MR. FROST: That must have been before my day.

SOME hon. MEMBER: You were here.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, and before the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost)

proceeds with other Bills, I may say that I think the whole House was looking forward with great anticipation to hear what the hon. member for York North (Mr.MacKenzie) for whom we all have the highest regard, and from whom we were particularly interested in hearing on this day. Can we have a report now of progress, or may we now hear from the hon. member for York North (Mr. MacKenzie)? The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will remember that he designated the hon. member for York North (Mr. MacKenzie) last night as his appointee for the purpose of reporting to this House the content of a certain broadcast in which we are all deeply interested and which I am sure the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would be the last to deny us the opportunity of hearing, particularly when his appointee is one from whom we all like to hear and only too seldom do we hear from him.

MR. FROST: I must say that in the hurry of things I completely overlooked that item, but I will certainly see that that is done at a later date.

SOME hon. MEMBER: A six-months hoist.

MR. FROST: I will have to get together with the hon. member for York North (Mr. MacKenzie) at a later date.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Would Monday be satisfactory?

MR. FROST: I will take that into consideration.

MR. Speaker, I have answers here to questions No. 145 and 146.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 23

THE MILK CONTROL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-third Order; Second reading, Bill No. 129, "An Act to amend The Milk Control Act", Mr. Kennedy.

HON. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 129, "An Act to amend The Milk Control Act".

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minis ter): Mr. Speaker, it seemed better with respect to this Bill that perhaps a statement of government policy should be given in connection with this matter, to be followed by an explanation by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy), which follows the procedure we followed the other day in relation to the Fair Remuneration for Females statute which received second reading.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is desirable I should give a statement of government policy lying behind this Bill and that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr.Kennedy) will immediately follow with an explanation of the details of the Act.

I may say that this Bill is going to the Committee of Agriculture. There are some features in the Bill which may be changed. I have in mind particularly the discretionary powers of the Board with respect to licences which I think, Mr. Speaker, may be too restrictive. I think perhaps the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr.Kennedy) may feel that the provisions of the Bill as before the House may have a restrictive side, as far as the Board is concerned. It may be that the hon. members of the Committee might feel that those powers should be amplified.

There has been some debate, we have had some

representations on that subject, and we are viewing it with quite an open mind, and it will go to the Committee on Agriculture and there some of those details may be discussed.

After many conferences with the producers, who, of course, are the farmers, and their organizations, and after consultations with the distributors and extensive reference to the report of the hon. Mr. Justice Wells and his Royal Commission, there is no question that there must be control and regulation of the milk industry, from the very start. I have asked our statistical department to prepare a certain statement, which I will table later and give copies to the leaders of the parties opposite. Those matters can also be considered by the Committee, because they give a very interesting background to this question. However, we have these things standing out, which we must consider today. These things are taking place and are happening now. There must be:

(1) The setting up of markets, that is, of milk markets in the areas of the same.

(2) Provisions for fair prices to farmers or producers within those markets having regard to conditions in each.

That, as you know, is arrived at by a collective bargaining arrangement, which is not being interfered with and in fact is being strengthened.

(3) There must be machinery providing for uniformity across Ontario, and expedition and despatch in dealing with the matters of price.

(4) The licencing of distributors.

Mr. Speaker, we can talk loosely about competition, but, efficiency in distribution, has a fundamental effect on the price paid not only to the producer buy by the consumer; and therefore, licencing and control of the number of distributors in an area is inseparably tied up with public interest and with convenience and efficiency. One only has to discuss this very difficult problem with farmers and their organizations, with the distributors, and refer to such reports as the report of the hon. Mr. Justice Wells, to see that that is a fundamental. Really, there is no escape from it.

(5) The powers of the Board relating to areas and to the conditions under which distributors will operate in the marketing areas. That is also another matter which we must face. These are just some of the things which are very fundamental to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, the principle of having a commodity fixed by ordinary laws and the laws of supply and demand is, of course, good. The principle, itself, is good. The great difficulty of this problem is of necessity the whole product must be controlled. It is controlled up to the point in the last two years, or since 1948, when it goes to the producer. The distributors, or the salesmen, themselves, are controlled to a very marked extent. Having arrived at that point the big question is as to how much competition is left, and when it comes to that point of selling to the producer, how much competition is there left when not only is there a control of the whole problem from the very commencement and there is very positive control of the licencing of the distributors; in other words, the

distributors are limited. The question immediately arises as to whether there is really any real competition at that point.

Going back to 1948 it appeared that we were coming into more normal economic times. It appeared that more distributors might come into the picture and that conditions would lead to a levelling off of prices and the creation of conditions which might lead and would lead to a very satisfactory free market. I think that was the point of view accepted by most people three years ago.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Not by us.

MR. FROST: Of course, you people always think ahead of everybody else.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I just hold up my two fingers.

SOME hon. MEMBER S: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: But the point is, Mr. Speaker, that actually the system of 1948 worked with a very fair degree of success during a period of de-control and trailing off of prices.

I will have some facts here, some particulars, which I want to give to the House in a few moments after the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) has spoken, if the House will grant me the indulgence of speaking at that time and tabling a statement which I have from our Ecpnomics Branch.

A tremendous change, however, in these days of 1951, indicates that what was hoped for in 1948 is simply not going to work now. We are now in a spiral of inflation and in conditions which are so different from those

anticipated in 1948 that we are virtually living in a different economic world. There may be competition -- these things may lead to competition under present conditions -- because of the personality of the driver and, to some degree, the quality of the milk or the form in which the milk is vended to the public, the attractiveness of it; but there appears to be no other competition which is really visible at the present time in the matter of the price of milk to the consumer; in other words, the limited number of distributors under present arrangements virtually put the matter of price, as far as the consumer is concerned, in the distributors' own hands. Of course, there still remains the possibility of distributors coming in and undercutting. That is a possibility. The other possibility is more feasible in the smaller markets, but, in a large market, like the Toronto area, this is not a very real possibility or a very great possibility.

There are one or two distributors in the Toronto area who have, for instance, a cash and carry system and they are undercutting prices at the present time, I think -- and I am speaking from hearsay only -- at about .18¢ a quart. That is a sort of cash and carry business. But, the market is so large that those cash and carry people, in coming in, in a limited way, can only affect a very small segment of the market. Therefore, you might say that the possibilities of any change in the competitive conditions in this area, here, are pretty remote at the moment.

There is also a real possibility of competition in cash and carry markets which now are beginning to appear

in certain Ontario areas. No doubt the hon. members of this House -- most of them -- have read the article which appeared, I think, in the Readers' Digest about the situation in Akron where cash and carry people have taken over there and have a very profound effect on the market in Akron. Of course, we get conflicting points of view on it. We have not any unanimity from the standpoint of the producer, the farmer, himself. There may be the element that milk in some of those areas is used as a loss leader, with the resultatn effect of depressed prices of milk to the producer. That may be the case. On the other hand, we might as well be frank about this matter, it does seem that if people want to go down to the sotre and carry milk home, themselves, probably a concession can be made in price. There is an argument advanced, on the other hand, against that, which may be a very real argument. Some people say that if that situation or that system is in vogue the tendency would be, perhaps, to carry home less milk than if it was delivered at home. Those are considerations which, of course, are very important considerations and which will have to be considered.

There is also this consideration with respect to the matter of lowering the price of milk, as to whether deliveries may be restricted to certain dates and the period of deliveries cut down. On the other hand, you have against that the question of refrigeration. Is there sufficient refrigeration in the area, in the homes in the area, to take care of that. Those are some of the very baffling and complicating features of this very difficult matter. Having taken all of these matters into consideration the government

has taken the view that no increase in the price of milk should take place over and above the ceiling prescribed by the Board. As stated yesterday, the Board will be enlarged under the regulations in the Act to include a producer, a distributor, a consumer and a Judge. It seemed to be wise that the Judge should have an overriding power in the event of an even division in that Board of four. It seems to be altogether desirable that instead of having a Judge or a single member of the Board that that Board should be enlarged to include other interests, but that, nevertheless, in the constitution of it, the Judge should have an overriding power which would come from an additional casting vote. The hearings of the Board will be in public. That is an innovation with respect to this problem in this province. It is a change over the conditions which existed prior to 1948 when the Board fixed the price or ceiling subject to confirmation by Orders in Council. I might as well tell the House the problem behind this matter in 1948. Here was the difficulty. The Milk Board met in camera. I think that is right. The Board met in camera and made its decisions as to what the price of milk should be. Then they sent it to the Cabinet Council for confirmation by Orders in Council. You can readily see this: the Cabinet Council would not have any idea of the technical matters behind this. Actually speaking, they were pretty nearly bound to accept the decision of the Board which was arrived at in camera. I can say to the hon. members of this House that if the Milk Board were to make a finding and were to refer it to the hon. members of this House, the hon. members of this House would find

themselves completely without statistical details or information. One cannot be an encyclopedia with respect to all questions. You would simply find that you would make your decision on the fact that you had confidence in the Board or you did not have confidence in the Board. That was the situation prior to 1948, and, I can say, from a standpoint of government, a situation which was wholly undesirable. We have taken steps in this procedure to avoid that.

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

The new provision will provide for the fullest publicity. In other words, the hearing is made in the open and persons who are interested in all of the conditions relating to the cost of milk will be made public and will be there including all the elements of production and distribution and the other things of that sort. The prices, of course, will be maximum prices; competition will be encouraged among the distributors but it will keep the sale of milk under the ceiling. Now, we have had to run the gauntlet of some criticism in the matter of the price of beer in this province; we have fixed there a ceiling but we have not prescribed that it is necessary that those prices be charged. In other words, we promote competition under the ceiling.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): You also fixed a floor.

MR. FROST: And I think that is a fair, proper approach to the problem. Now, that is what we are doing in that particular industry, intentionally, that same principle will apply here.- the fact that the Board will fix a price which is a maximum price and there may be competition under that ceiling. In other words, the amounts fixed will be maximum and that will not deter any distributor from selling under that amount in these competitive price conditions. I think those are psychological factors which have an effect on the public thought. In 1948 the prices were fixed as between the producers and distributors and they had nothing to say about it, that is prior to 1948. Under

the scheme of 1948, I think the public and the producers and the farmers all felt that prices could be fixed by the distributors without having regard to the interests of either, and you just discuss that with the producers and you will find that is a very real consideration. In all fairness, I would say that all the evidence that we have is the distributors have attempted to act fairly in this matter and the price of milk today has increased to a far less extent than other commodities. That will be shown by the statements which I shall give to the House in a few minutes. I am quite sure that both producers and distributors recognize that it is desirable to keep the price as low as possible. All these things will be given to the Committee on Agriculture. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I want to underscore that, nevertheless, there is feeling current in the public that their interests are entirely in the hands of somebody else. Now that is one of the psychological effects of the present situation and I think myself it is the most important of all. The new provisions will take care of that; the introduction of public hearings and consumer representation will certainly assure the public that if increases take place that they will have all of the cards on the table face up. Now, I think that is a consideration which is very important from a standpoint of public relationships. This may not be a very parliamentary expression but it is one that conveys the meaning, and that is that "John Public" feels if this thing is done that all the cards are on the table and they can see what they look like.

That is the provision that applies here. After all, Mr. Speaker, the public are fair, they recognize that the farmers must have a fair price and a fair profit. They likewise recognize that employees of the distributors should be paid fair wages and that the distributors in the business should be allowed reasonable profits which will enable them to maintain modern machinery, high standards of sanitation and operate as a free enterprise concern in a free enterprise economy and province. I think our people recognize all of those things. I should say, Mr. Speaker, that all of those things are indispensable. It seems to me the public can feel that,under this new system, they are not being taken to town by anybody. In other words, it is not a question, as in the Act previous to 1948, that the amount was fixed as largely between producers and distributors nor will they feel as they did under the 1948 Act that perhaps if the whole situation is controlled to a point that in the city of Toronto, for instance, 35 or 50 distributors set the price, the public will feel that when it comes to that critical point as to what he is going to pay, he is going to have some say in it and see that what is done is fair and that the cards are on the table face up.

There are other important matters in the Act which were given by the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) yesterday and which will be elaborated by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy). I shall not elaborate on these matters other than to say that the representation of the producers, that is, their

representations to us, for a uniform administration which comes from one judge is wholly desirable. This principle will be carried out as far as possible.

You can understand if you appoint one Judge for Ontario and the Judge should be ill or away and perhaps something comes up that you have to have provision for alternative representation but, nevertheless, the fact is, the greatest satisfaction will come from one Judge and will produce a uniformity across the whole table.

The matter of carrying on with bargaining agreements until new agreements have been arrived at will also be a very real form of complaints from the producers. It is also being taken care as indicated by the Act, when agreements terminate, when there really are no agreements there, there is provision to carry on until a new agreement is arrived at.

There is one other feature in the Bill to which I might refer; that is the freezing of the price as of midnight, March 14th, which means these prices will apply until the Board, in its discretion, decides to change them. Mr. Speaker, we here have had other experiences with controls, we all have. Where legislation is passed and not acted upon, there may be an invitation for people to increase prices, so that sometimes it might happen. That is the purpose of this particular provision; we have regard for those experiences and, therefore, to avoid such a condition in this province,it is proposed and this provision is introduced which means that costs remain as they are till the Board, by public hearing, decides otherwise.

The Board will agree that this legislation should be enacted at once in the Toronto area. Increased wages for drivers and other engaged in the distribution are currently being discussed which may mean that this increase will entail an increase in the price of milk. The producers, that is the farmers, also complain that their prices should be increased. The sooner this Act is in operation and the Board begins to function, the better. The present price freeze is clearly indicated by the Act, of course, and is subject to change after the Board have public hearings and decides that conditions indicate an alteration, that there should be an alteration in price.

If this Bill is given second reading today, it could go immediately to the Committee on Agriculture and it may be possible to have the Act in operation some day during the coming week. If that is the case, His Honor has indicated he will come and give the Royal assent which will avoid delays and avoid the injustice which may come from delay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) will refer to details in this Act. I have tried to have the considerations lying behind the policy of the government in this regard. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that we are looking at this situation in the light of March, 1951, which is quite unlike, I think, any comparable period in the history of the Province. We have to be alive to the situations which exist in this land of ours and we are taking a realistic view of these conditions and that is why this Bill

is advanced and that is why there is quite a fundamental change in the policy involved.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, may I, in moving second reading, follow what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said? I think the main trouble with the present Milk Act is, irrespective of that something is wrong in setting the price of this milk of ours that is so essential a food, it is one of the most essential foods that the world knows of. People must buy it. You can put up the price of chocolate bars or candy or clothes and you can buy them or leave them alone, but you must buy a bottle of milk every morning - it is essential. You must buy food for yourself, your wife and family and it is the one essential food. The misunderstanding about the price of milk is because people feel they are forced to buy milk and they want the cheapest grade possible. I was very much impressed last Fall when the price went up a cent. I make it a business to go amongst the public fairly often and hear what their reactions are and I heard a woman who was buying a bottle of pop objecting about the increased price of milk. She was a very fine, sensible woman and I came to the conclusion that she could buy that bottle or leave it alone but she had to buy a quart of milk a day because she had one child and it was the necessity of buying that which she was objecting to. She did not object to anyone getting a fair price. I want to make that clear - there is nobody in the province of Ontario I know of who objects to everybody getting a fair price but they

do not want to pay anybody an exorbitant price for such a wonderful utility as milk.

Last Fall when the distributors raised the price one cent - which they had a perfect right to do and I have not the least doubt that it was essential - but the way they did it, they said, "We are the people to decide; we are going to raise the price one cent and we are going to give one-third of that to the farmer, one-third to labour and keep the other third ourselves." Mr. Speaker, they are not the people to decide and that made a tremendous impression on me to have some body of men to decide that the price should go up. Nobody objects to a fair price for fair labour. That was one of the reasons that this Act was brought into force at this time.

I want to say a word about the one Judge. This province is billed with probably five or six different prices, milk is produced cheaper in some places than others; transport comes into it, for instance in the Niagara district. It is a high price district and there are certain lower price districts. I am hoping the Judge will not wait until the Board meets but he will, with the auditors, go around this province and decide by an honest statement of the farmers the cost of producing milk, what the transportation is and by the information of the distributors, what is cost to distribute it. It may be that a different method may come about for distributing our milk.

I would like to say something we have done about milk. It was a very lucky thing that this House took the stand some years ago that we started artificial

pasteurizing and I want all hon. members to know that this brings about a condition where a cow can provide more milk at a lower value than before.

27 years ago I introduced the first Milk Control Act and the amendments have come along in that Act. I found the producers against me, wondering what was going to happen, knowing things were wrong and wondering what was going to happen. I have the distributors wondering what was going to happen but it worked out fairly well as all good things do. If a thing is good, we have enough brains in this province to work it out and a good thing always comes to the top. Back in 1933 they wanted to bring in compulsory pasteurization. I was against it because I felt you have to have 60% of the people of the province behind anything to make it a sure thing; if you only have a small number behind it, it fails. With the aid of a large majority, it can be carried through. However, Mr. Mitchell Hepburn decided to put in compulsory pasteurization. There are many things I like about Mr. Hepburn and the thing I liked most was the courage he had. If Mr. Hepburn thought a thing was right, he did it and he brought in compulsory pasteurization. Now, we have done something to make milk better in the province of Ontario. Let me emphasize this - there is no place you can go and buy better milk than in the province of Ontario. I repeat that the second time - the housewives in the province of Ontario, there is no place they can go, Europe, the United States or any other province, where they can buy better milk than they have in the province of Ontario.

That is brought into effect by many methods: our drivers, our distributors, our truckers who bring in the milk, distribute it before the sun comes up to keep it nice and cool and partly by our feeding of cattle. I mean to emphasize that we have made great strides in the feeding of milk cows; we have proved that good pastures will give better milk. We test milk for butter fat only but more important than butter fat for the feeding of people is calcium, magnesium and iron. There are 17 minerals in the milk and that is what makes milk so good for us.

As you know, we started the pasture improvement during the crops grants many years ago and it has been a wonderful thing. I was very much interested three years ago in going around these pastures and I would go to one man. and he would say his cattle were doing extremely well, they were giving a lot of milk; another man would say that they were not doing so well and so I thought there must be something wrong. These pastures are all the same - they are all the same grass, the same fertilizer put in, but the cattle are not doing the same. We went to probably 50 pastures and pulled the grass for 50 pastures and had the Ontario Research Foundation make a study of it. We found out that the protein which is of great value ran from 7% to 28%, some three times as much in some places as in others. We came to the conclusion that you cannot put grass on poor land and have the same effect. You have to start with good land and so we have new grass, hoping to get down hundreds of feet of roots that would

bring these minerals up from the soil to give us finer pastures. We hoped to have a better milk and a cheaper milk and we increased the grant tremendously as soon as the Act came in.

(TAKE "C" FOLLOWS)

There are two types of ensilage, one is corn, and the other is grass. The grass ensilage comes in nice and brown, while the corn comes in white. Vitamin "A", which is so important to us all, is in the brown milk, but the white milk has not the vitamin "A" in it. The coloured milk has. So some hundreds of farmers are using the grass which will make better milk, and I am looking for the day to come when all the cows will be fed on the grass ensilage, and we will then have better food.

There is another thing I would like to give to the House, and that is to find out the cost of milk. There were 1100 herds tested. We had them for a year, and we found one herd averaged 3900 pounds per cow; another herd averaged over 12000 pounds. That is quite a difference in the figures, and everyone who has seen these figures know that on the cows which only give 3500 pounds, they are losing money. I had a gentleman in to see me three or four months ago, and he thought of having a sale, because of the high price of meat, and he said that the cows which only gave a low poundage, would not be bought. He took them, and milked them while he was feeding them, and then he finally sold them. He was trying to get a high grade cow, and by artificial breeding, tried to secure one which would produce more milk.

I consider the work we are doing under Dr. Patterson of tremendous value. He is working on the costs of some of our commodities. It is certain that a cow with a large production, does make money. That is the whole thing; we are going to freeze the price of milk in this province. I like this new Bill; I like the implications in it. As the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said, they may have changes in the Agricultural Committee, and we will have a meeting of that Agricultural Committee at 11 o'clock on Monday, and will go over this Bill. Many things will be discussed which cannot be discussed today, and I hope to come out of the Committee with a Bill

which will meet public approval.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE : Mr. Speaker, so far as the C.C.F. members of this House are concerned we have come to the conclusion, in a very short time, that this Bill ought to be given second reading and referred to the Agricultural Committee. I say that, notwithstanding the fact that the text of the Bill did not reach any of us till 1:30 p.m. to-day, and the further fact that it was given first reading only yesterday, nevertheless our feeling is that under the present situation, this is legislation which ought to be expedited, provided it can be expedited without prejudice to due consideration. I am bound at this point to make the reservation, that the language in the Bill -- in part at least -- lacks lucidity, and lacks precision, and I would certainly agree with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that it might be improved in the Agricultural Committee. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that Committee is functioning very satisfactorily, and has in the past, and no doubt will make a great contribution to the matters connected with it. As the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) says this is a very important Bill, which embodies several very important principles, some of which have considerable merit from our point of view, and some of which have not.

I do not propose to take up time today to discuss it in detail, but, Mr. Speaker, the manner in which this Bill has entered the legislative grist mill, is so extraordinary that I do not think it proper to allow it to pass without some comment.

I was interested to hear the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) say that conditions in March, 1951, are not the same as conditions in March, 1948. Of course, that is perfectly obvious, although some of the conditions are not as different as he suggested.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, so far as the milk problem is concerned, the situation on March 15th, 1951, and the situation on February 1st, 1951, are not notably different, and the House will remember that on the 1st day of February we listened to the Speech from the Throne in which there was no reference whatsoever to this question, although every hon. member of the House must have known that it was one of the most urgent questions before the people of Ontario, and before this Legislature. What the reason may be, possibly the government can explain, but that issue has been coming to the front for a good many months. It is now many months since the Ontario Federation of Agriculture presented a brief to the government, putting forth the proposal that the Act should be amended in important particulars.

It is now some time since the Milk Producers' League, which represents the milk producers, passed a resolution, on January 4th, 1951, with which I am sure the government is familiar, stating as follows:

> "WHEREAS in the early thirties the Fluid Milk Industry was in a very chaotic condition,
> WHEREAS the Government of that day to correct this condition enacted The Milk Control Act and appointed a Milk Control Board with powers to enforce and administrate same,
> WHEREAS the results of this Act gave stability and confidence to the dairy industry,
> WHEREAS under the present Act conditions are fast reverting to those of the hungry thirties,
> THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Ontario Whole Milk Producers' League in annual session urge the Ontario Act, 1950, returning former price setting powers to the Milk Control Board."

That was the producers' point of view as clearly stated on January 4th. The point of view of the distrib utors the government had even longer, so they had due notice that this matter was coming to a head, because as far back as last Fall, when there was another increase in the price of milk to the consumers of the city of Toronto, express warning was given to the distributors that another price increase might occur in the city of Toronto before long, so no one can suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government did have many months' notice that this was an urgent problem, and a very serious problem, as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) now admits. However, we had no statement of policy about it from the government in November, in December, in January or in February. We could not get any statement of policy in the debate on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. We could not even ascertain whether the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) was going to introduce any Bill relating to this matter or not.

The hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Isley) on February 15th gave notice that he would introduce a Bill, and that at least had the result that the following Monday, the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) gave notice that he would introduce a Bill, but he did not, in fact, introduce any Bill until Monday, March the 5th.

When he introduced that Bill, I could hardly believe my eyes. However, perhaps the least said about it, the better.

Now, with regard to the problems which the Bill before the House attempts to meet.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) very properly dealt with the question, from the point of view of the consumers, the producers and then the distributors. All of these people have their problems, and they are all substantial. There is no question about that. I could go a little further than the hon. Prime Minister

(Mr. Frost) went when he said there has not been too much competition amongst the distributors since 1948. Apparently, the theory was that 1948 was the year we were returning to "normalcy" -- I think that is the right word --

MR. FROST: That is President Harding's expression.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes. President Harding's expression and the theory reflected his political thinking and was about as successful as the sort of President he later proved to be.

But we were returning to "normalcy", and competition should be allowed full play, and this would result in the survival of the efficient distributors, and the protection of their customers, at fair prices.

Mr. Speaker, what a beautiful theory. At the time that theory was applied by the government, the Federal government was in the middle of removing price controls, and it was apparent that prices were on the way up. In the upward movement of prices, the distributors participated. Of course, they also sustained increases in their costs; no doubt about that, but the distributors were in the position of being what I have repeatedly termed a monopoly, as far as the larger distributors were concerned.

They were in a position to fix their own prices, and to be sure it was more than adequate to protect their own interests. The Prime Minister said the price has not doubled, due to inflation. That statement leaves me somewhat cold, and for this reason -- I have not seen this mentioned in public, and I think it should be -- during the period of controlled prices the consumers in a city like Toronto paid 11 cents a quart for milk. The price is now 20 cents. That is an increase of approximately 90%. I agree that is as less than the increase in the general food index, but the point I want to make is that during the period of controlled prices, the average producer of fluid milk, including the subsidy, was getting $3.00 a

hundred weight in the winter season, and $2.80 in the summer season. At the present time, the producer, if he is in the Toronto area, is getting $4.20. Mr. Speaker, that increase is not 90%. The cost of milk to the dairies has not risen by 90%. The price, as far as producers are concerned, has only risen about 40%.

That is the point the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should have made, but he did not make it, so I will make it. They charge 90% more, and pay the producer about 40 % more. It is true, is it not? What is not true about it? Is there anything wrong with those figures?

MR. FROST: I think you are very far out, but not any more than you usually are.

MR. KENNEDY: The milk that comes --

MR. JOLLIFFE: Do you agree with those figures?

MR. KENNEDY: No.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What is wrong with those figures? I said they are approximate, but what is wrong with them?

MR. FROST: I could give the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) a statement prepared by the Statistical Department, a part of which is on the hurried side.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Does it relate to the statement I just made?

MR. FROST: It does, yes .

MR. JOLLIFFE: All right, let us have it.

MR. FROST: They were prepared for me under date of today.

"Since 1939 --

there is some supporting material, which I will be glad to give to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe).

MR. JOLLIFFE: My statement did not refer to 1939.

"Since 1939 the price of milk has increased from 12 cents to 20 cents a quart - a rise of 67 per cent. The cost of living index in the same period has gone up 73 per cent; wages have about doubled. The price paid to producers for milk has increased 100 per cent. The general food index in February, 1951 was, however, 123 per cent above that in 1939. Thus the price of milk has increased substantially less than the rise in the price of foods in general, and the amount received by dairy farmers has also advanced less. A rise in the price of milk to 21 cents would involve an increase in price over 1939 of 75 per cent.

On March 13, 1951, representatives of the Toronto Milk Distributors' Association, submitted a statement to the Prime Minister which revealed these points : In 1939 the distributor paid the p roducer $2.10 per cwt., equivalent (on the basis of 38 quarts to a hundred pounds) to 5.52 cents per quart or 46 per cent of the selling price of 12 cents. The distributors' spread was 6.48 cents. In March, 1951, the producer was receiving $4.20 per cwt., equivalent to 11.05 cents per quart or 55 per cent of the selling price. The distributors' margin was 8.95 cents. It was pointed out that whereas the producer was now being paid 5.52 cents per quart more than in 1939, an increase of 100 per cent, the distributor was receiving only 2.47 cents per quart more, an increase over his margin in 1939 of 38 per cent.

On the basis of 38 quarts to 100 pounds these figures are accurate within the fraction of a decimal point. Actually, a quart of milk weighs 2.58 pounds and therefore 100 pounds of fluid milk would theoretically produce 38.76 quarts of milk. It has been suggested that a distributor would be regarded as efficient if he obtained 38 quarts from 100 pounds of milk. Nevertheless, the allowance for wastage seems, logically, a distributors' cost and in

the following table calculations have been made on a quart of milk having a weight of 2.58 pounds. On this basis, the division of selling price is somewhat more favourable to the distributor.

Year	Buying Price			(1) Selling Price		Spread Between Buying and Selling Price
	Effective Date	Per Cwt	Per Quart	Effective Date	Per Quart	
		$	¢		¢	¢
1939	-	2.10	5.42	-	12	6.58
1941	Jan. 18	2.40	6.19	Jan. 18	13	6.81
1942	Sept. 1(2)	2.50	6.45	Sept. 1	13	6.55
	Dec. (3)	2.50	6.45	Dec.	11 + 2¢ subsidy	6.55
1946	June 1(4)	2.50	6.45	June 1	13	6.55
	Oct. 1(5)	3.50	9.03	Oct. 1	16	6.97
1947	Dec. 1	4.05	10.45	Dec. 1	18	7.55
1949	Oct. 20	4.07½	10.51	Oct. 20	19	8.49
1950	Nov. 2	4.20	10.84	Sept. 1	20	9.16

The distributor's margin increased between 1939 and 1951 by 2.58¢ per quart or 39 per cent, while that of the farmer increased by 5.42¢ or 100 per cent.

Summary

	Producer Received Quart	Selling Price	Distributor's Spread
1939	5.42¢	12¢	6.58¢
1951	10.84¢	20¢	9.16¢
Increase 1951 over 1939	5.42¢	8¢	2.58¢
" " " "	100%	66.7%	39%

	1939	1951
Percentage of Selling Price Received by Producers	45.2	54.2
" " " " " " Distributors	54.8	45.8

Although the growth in the distributor's spread has been considerably smaller than that of the farmer since 1939, there are several factors to be borne in mind. In the first place, the volume of sales between 1939 and 1951 has risen from 7½ million quarts per month in 1939 to an average monthly level in 1950 of 10 3/4 million quarts, an increase of 43 per cent. This increase in volume of sales has undoubtedly lowered distributors' unit costs and made it possible for the dairies to operate on a smaller margin. Secondly the prices paid producers in 1939 were depressed prices.

(1) Conversion factor: 1 quart equals 2.58 lbs.

(2) A temporary subsidy of 30 cents per 100 pounds of fluid milk was paid to producers from December 22, 1941 to April 30, 1942. Upon a revision of the whole price structure of the dairying industry, the subsidy to producers was set at 25 cents per 100 pounds on September 1, 1942. This was later raised to 55 cents per 100 pounds in October, 1943.

(3) In December 1942, a subsidy of 2 cents a quart to distributors became effective to offset a reduction by them of 2 cents a quart in the price charged to consumers.

(4) On June 1, 1946 the 2 cent subsidy to distributors was discontinued.

(5) On September 30, 1946 the subsidy to producers was withdrawn.

Price Adjustments

During most of the period from 1939 to 1946 the price of milk was held down by subsidies. Milk was 12 cents a quart from 1939 to January 18, 1941. It then rose to 13 cents. In December, 1941, by reason of a subsidy equivalent to 2 cents per quart, the retail price was fixed at 11 cents and it remained at this level up to June, 1946. At that date, the control was handed back to the Province and the subsidy discontinued, with the result that the price rose to 13 cents. On October 1, 1946, it was raised from 13 cents to 16 cents when the producers' subsidy of 55 cents per hundred pounds was withdrawn and the price to the producers was advanced on the subsidy price from $3.05 per hundred pounds to $3.50 per hundred pounds. It would therefore appear that the distributor received ½ cent of the increase from 12 cents to 16 cents and the producer 3½ cents.

In December, 1947 the price of milk went up to 18 cents and the producer received another 55 cents per cwt. or nearly 1½ cents per quart, while the distributor received a little over ½ cent. In October, 1949, the price went up another cent and the distributor got most of it.

On September 1, 1950 it rose to 20 cents, approximately 1/3 of which went to the producer and 2/3 to the distributor who paid about 1/3 to labour. Thus of the increase in price from 12¢ in 1939 to 16¢ in October 1946 the distributor obtained less than 1/2¢ and the producer over 3½¢. Of the increase in price from 16¢ to 20¢ since November 1, 1947 the distributor received approximately 2 1/5¢ and the producer 1 4/5¢, out of which both had to meet higher labour and material costs.

Revenue from 1¢ Price Increase

Last year sales of milk in the Toronto area averaged 10-3/4 million quarts per month. An increase in price of 1¢ per quart would produce additional average monthly revenue of about $107,560. The distributors stressed at the meeting of March 13, 1951 that about 25 per cent of the distributors' fluid milk sales were composed of pints and half-pints, which, it was contemplated, would not be increased in price. The implication was that the additional revenue would be only about $80,000 per month. As against this suggestion, it might be argued that the higher price of quarts would tend to divert the consumption to pints, which selling for 12¢, or the equivalent quantitatively of 24¢ a quart, might result - even after allowing for some extra costs for bottling - in a slightly higher profit margin on increased sales of pints. Without a breakdown of costs, this supposition is, of course, speculative. Some offset should be made if pints and half-pints were not increased in price and allowance should also be made for a slight decline in demand resulting from the increase in price. A 1¢ increase in the price of quarts would therefore yield the distributors something less than $107,000 monthly. The distributors maintained that they were committed to pay wage increases of about $40,000 monthly and together with other increases in operating costs, a 1¢ increase in quarts would be required.

C-11

Relation of Price to Demand

Both producers and distributors have stated that the price of milk should be kept as low as possible in order to maintain demand and the benefits of wide-spread consumption. Obviously, the volume of business done has an important bearing on operating costs, and the experience of the last several years shows that price increases do affect the demand for milk. While the average monthly consumption of the milk in the Toronto market in 1950 was 10 3/4 million quarts as against 7 1/2 million quarts in 1939, sales in 1950 were 1.1 million quarts per month less than in 1946 when the population was somewhat smaller. That is a decrease of nearly 1 0 per cent, and undoubtedly the rise in price had some effect."

(TAKE "D" FOLLOWS)

I want to say, in submitting these figures, that they are figures which we are not submitting as actually correct beyond peradventure of doubt, or not subject to argument, but they are at least figures which might be considered with respect to this problem.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am very glad to have the statement for what it is worth. It does not contradict the statement I made; it reinforces my point, for this reason, that if you are going to take comparisons between the present day and the depression period between 1934 and 1939 you will always get a very misleading result, so far as agricultural prices are concerned. You will get that every time. I did not take that comparison. I know perfectly well that in 1935 the price of milk was very low, indeed, it was down to around $1.50 per one hundred weight to the producer. The fact is that when we got into the war period milk production had to be maintained in the interest of national security as well as public health and the price was more or less stabilized for a period of time under conditions which were not depression conditions and which were not boom conditions but which were subject to price control. That is the period on which I made comparison. The Comparison between the price of that period and at the present time is that the price paid by the consumer to the distributor has risen by approximately 90% and by the distributor to the producer by approximately 40%.

MR. FROST: To what date did you go back?

MR. JOLLIFFE: 1945 and 1946. I pointed out that that was a period of controlled prices; indeed, it was a period of subsidy, and the producer's price included a subsidy. Nevertheless, that is the period with

respect to which I choose to make a comparison, because it is that period from which we moved into the present inflationary ---

MR. FROST: With respect to the figures on that calculation comparable to these, I would be very glad to check them over, because it is a very interesting point of view.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I will get that for the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). Anyone can make comparisons with the pre-war period. Some of us think, however, that the comparison is not a very fair one so far as any part of the agricultural industry is concerned, or any other depressed industry. There were also certain wage earners who were notoriously depressed in those days. Comparisons with that period can be made, but I question their validity for the purpose of a discussion such as this.

MR. FROST: I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) is quite fair in his argument. I will say, furthermore, I will check through the figures of 1948 to the present time and see what they look like. That is an interesting point of view which is worthy of consideration.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I want to make another concession, because I think it is important and because I think it is something that those of us who are consumers -- and most of us are -- should bear in mind, and that is, as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) pointed out, and as the distributors of other commodities are fond of pointing out, the price of milk has not gone up as high as the general food index. At the same time, milk is such a vital commodity that

this government is being forced, and I think any government would be, to deal with this problem in a special way and by way of special legislation.

We do have to keep in mind, however, the fact that the dairy industry by and large, notwithstanding some of the tales one hears, has not been doing too well. If it were, Mr. Speaker, if the dairy industry had been doing well in recent years then I would not see so many buyers up here purchasing Canadian heifers and cows to take down to the United States, because Canadians would not be selling them if our industry were as healthy as it should be. That is a basic problem which we have to face up to either in the Agricultural Committee or in this House. What is going to be the future of our dairy industry? If, as I think the National Dairy Council recently suggested, our dairy herds have been depleted by about 500,000 head, and if that process continues, where do we get the milk 5, 10 or 15 years from now to serve the needs of our growing population? There is a very real and serious problem. I think we will have to it a great deal more attention in this House in the future.

My next concession is that I consider the major distributors have operated in a monopolistic fashion rather than a competitive fashion and their costs have risen. There is no doubt about that. I will go even further. Some of the dairies in this province are in difficulty. Many of the smaller dairies and certainly the less efficient dairies are in difficulty. There are others who are not in difficulty. There is just no excaping that fact. This may not be the proper stage at which to raise the matter, but we do want to hear very fully from the hon. Minister of Agriculture

(Mr. Kennedy), at some point, the results of his investigation into the costs of dairy operations at Belleville, or elsewhere, if his auditors have been anywhere else. I think that that investigation ought to have been undertaken long ago. There is a report in today's press that the hon. Minister of Agriculture's (Mr. Kennedy) enquiry has brought to light some rather surprising profits in the case of two Belleville dairies, results which were surprising to all those who had previously assumed that these operations operated on a very narrow margin; but perhaps it would be better to get that information at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) described the desirability of which the government is at last impressed of vesting the tribunal with the power to fix the price to the consumer after public hearing. I agree. I think that is the way it has to be done. I also suggest to the government that it is not sufficient to hold the hearing in public. He mentioned the three interests concerned -- the consumer, the distributor, the producer. If the hearing is held in public obviously those three interests can be represented and we would all expect them to be represented. I say it is not only essential the hearing should be public but it is essential the three interests involved should actually be represented and I hope that some way will be found of making certain that the consumers are adequately represented. The producers, fortunately, have an organization which is capable of doing an excellent job. But, that is not all; there is a third requirement, that is that the tribunal should have the

authority to get at the facts and to enable the interested parties to bring out the facts. I know that the costs of a producer are a difficult thing to get at from an accounting point of view. There is no doubt about that. I suggest that up to now the costs of the distributors have been even more difficult to get at than the costs of the producer and for a very different reason. Everybody has had difficulty about that. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) has had difficulty about that; the hon. Mr. Justice Wells had difficulty about that when he made his enquiry. I do not think the tribunal can do an effective job on behalf of the public, on behalf of all the parties interested, unless it proves to enjoy sufficient authority to get at the facts.

MR. KENNEDY: Correct.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If we fail to do that we may wreck this project at the very beginning.

I am pleased to know that the government is persuaded of the need for one arbitrator, rather than every judicial Tom, Dick and Harry who can be found for the job. Under the misguided Act of 1948 the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) had the power to name a County Court Judge or a District Court Judge, and with deplorable results. I will again make one of my concessions. One or more of the Judges did a good job. The remainder had to be educated. The process of education was so lengthy that the eventual result was unsatisfactory.

I have made a survey of the arbitrations which have been held since 1947, that is, from November 1, 1947,

down to September 29, 1950. There were, if I am correct in this, 25 arbitrations. These arbitrations were presided over by 11 different judges. Eleven different men took on this highly technical, difficult job. It is not surprising to me that the resulting patchwork system of prices was in some cases more or less satisfactory and in other cases very unsatisfactory to both producers and consumers -- and I imagine also to the distributors in some cases. So that, it would be a great improvement if we could have one arbitrator; although, in passing, I would point out that the present Bill, like the previous Bill, does not provide for the appointment of a single arbitrator in these matters in the province of Ontario. I know it could mean that, but it could also mean 11 Judges once again presiding over 25 arbitrations.

MR. KENNEDY: It may be; but we will change it in Committee so there will be one.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Certainly it is desirable that anyone vested with such great responsibility as we contemplate here should be qualified by experience, by knowledge --

MR. KENNEDY: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: As well as by a judicial approach to make a decision.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, I must say again that the manner in which this matter has come before us is unfortunate, to say the least. The House has been sitting for six to seven weeks. First reading of this Bill was given yesterday. We are asked to give it second reading today. It is now suggested it should go to the Agriculture Committee at 11:00 o'clock on Monday morning. This may be necessary in the present circumstances but it is not the proper way in which to process important

legislation. It is not our fault that it has been done in this way. I think it must be said that the government has been lax, indeed, in allowing such an important problem to drift so long and then to bring in a Bill at what might be called the last moment, or, the eleventh hour, to use the expression I used earlier in the Session, and to expect the House to do a satisfactory piece of work on that Bill in a matter of three or four days. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), indeed, suggested that possibly it could receive assent by Wednesday night. That may be desirable. It may be quite important that it should become law by Wednesday -

MR. KENNEDY: Let it stand, if you want to.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not want a delay. I want it to be expedited. I am not responsible for all the delay there has been in this matter. I do say with great emphasis that I cannot think of any possible excuse for the long delay there has been and for the resulting haste with which this Bill is being introduced, and apparently must be processed through three readings and through two Committees of this House. I would like to add that the Bill was given first reading yesterday. It seems to me that it would have been only fair on the part of the government to make certain that we of the opposition had the text of the new Bill at an earlier point. I happen to know that the text of this Bill was here in the House before one o'clock today. It was not delivered to me until 1:30. I do not think it was delivered to the hon. members on my left until 1:30. Certainly no serious effort was made to get the text into our hands as early as possible.

I suggest also it would have been fair and reasonable to get the text of the Bill into the hands of those who represent the interested parties. I refer to the producers' organization, to the distributors, if you will, and to those who represent the consumer interests. I think that could have been done. They were not even advised that it would be given second reading today although they were vitally interested. I am a little surprised that the government should be so careless of its public relations in these matters. What the reason may be perhaps we may hear told at a later point. It does seem to me that with respect to a matter of such great public importance a little more consideration might have been given to the opposition and also to the interested parties.

There are many more comments I could make on this Bill, but I will not do so. I will reserve them for the Agricultural Committee.

I repeat, we wish this legislation to be expedited. We hape and trust we shall be able to make some improvement in it. I might say I regret the failure of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), or the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) today to defend or explain in any way one or two of the important principles of the Bill, such as the proposed repealing of Section 14. There is a principle involved there for which no justification has been offered and I would certainly be interested to hear what possible justification there is for it. However, it may be that the government's position is, again, the less said about that the better.

We want the Bill expedited. We will do our best to assist in making it a good Bill. If we have criticisms to offer they will be offered in good faith and we trust they will be given due consideration. We hope above all else, Mr. Speaker, that when this Bill reaches the Statute Book we shall have a Milk Control Act at last which will provide adequate protection for the interests of milk producers and consumers in respect of a vital commodity.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, we are now discussing the second edition of the government's legislative intentions to amend The Milk Control Act in this session of the Legislature. We are not at all sure that even this Bill appears in its final form. We heard the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) just a few minutes ago say "Come on down to the Agricultural Committee and we will write a Bill down there which will meet with the approval and satisfaction of all concerned". That is, to say the least, a rather irregular way of putting the government legislation before the House.

MR. KENNEDY: It has always been my way, to take every Bill down there and get it amended by the people. I do not think I ever got an objection from the farmers.

MR. OLIVER: The process of education as directed by the government is difficult to follow. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) introduced a Bill some weeks ago. I do not know where he got the inspiration for it. I imagine he discussed the matter with the producers, with the consumers and with the distributors before he introduced that Bill; but the

Bill, when it came into the House, had no friends except the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) and now, even he has deserted it and was very glad to move for its discharge. This has been a retreat from Moscow, so far as the government is concerned.

This Bill is brought in by the government for the avowed purpose of correcting some of the abuses which have arisen in relation to the sale and the processing of milk in the province of Ontario. I agree with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and with the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) that the milk situation in this province, not only as if affects the producer and the consumer but the distributor as well, is in a state of near chaos. It is the obligation of the government, yea of the Legislature, as a whole, to bring into this House at this present session legislation which will, in a measure, at least, correct that situation. The situation which has developed -- and I say this seriously -- is, in my judgment, a product of the government's own architecture. When, in 1948, they moved the amendments to the Milk Control Act, they did, in my judgment, at that time, lay the foundation for the trouble which has since been built up. I am quite proud to say today that when that legislation was going through the House I made on that occasion a speech in which I said that I wholly disagreed with the amendments which were offered by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) and since that time on every occasion on which I have had the opportunity I have urged the government to retrace its steps in this particular matter and to put the matter of price fixing back

within the orbit of the Milk Control Board. Nowwe have today before us a new Bill. I would say to the House quite frankly that it is an improvement on the one which was moved to be discharged yesterday. Any Bill was bound to be an improvement on that one. If you moved at all it was bound to be in the right direction. The Bill which is before the House now makes some very definite recommendations. I am not prepared at the moment to give full endorsation to all the principles set out in the Bill. I do not think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would expect us, having regard to the short time we have had to peruse this Bill, to give complete approval at this time. We are ready to facilitate the passage of this Bill through second reading in order that it may go to the Committee and there be discussed; and, as the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) said, it may be after that discussion we will get a Bill which will meet with the approval of all concerned.

This new Bill widens the representation of the Milk Control Board. I think that is a good move, a move in the right direction.

(TAKE "E" FOLLOWS)

It also gives to the Board the power to set the maximum prices for milk but it retains in the Bill the old method of arbitration insofar as a settlement of price is concerned between the producer and the distributor and the authority that is set up to continue that arbitration is an authority which, I gather, is apart from the Board itself. On that particular point I want to reserve my opinion until I have gone into it more fully. I rather feel that the powers that are now being delegated to the Judge of the County Court should have been delegated in this instance to the Milk Control Board particularly when the set-up of that Board had been widened to include all the interested parties, but that matter can be more fully discussed as we go into committee stage and into the Committee on Agriculture. I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) the composition of the Milk Control Board should have been set out in the Bill. How are you going to establish the four-man Board? I presume it is the hon. Minister's (Mr. Kennedy) intention to have it by regulation. I would say that this House is entitled to know just how the Board is to be made up. We are entitled to pass in this House on the composition of the Board and it is one thing which, in my judgment, should not be left to regulations and I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) on reflection would agree with that. Put it in the Bill, let us see what you are going to do. We have had some difficulty with this government ih regard to what they did by regulations, we are leaving altogether too much to regulation, not only in this legislation but in much of the other legislation that has been passed through this House. The day has come in this

province when the things we intend to do we say in the Bill rather than do them by regulation. There has been altogether too much of that in recent years.

MR. FROST: You would not appoint the Commissioners?

MR. OLIVER: There is nothing in the Bill that this legislature will pass on. Say what you are going to do in the Bill, it is all by regulation and that is why I am objecting to it and I think it is a sound and legitimate objection.

MR. FROST: The hon.member (Mr. Oliver) knows it is impossible to name them, it would not be reasonable to name the personnel of the Commission.

MR. OLIVER: I am not saying you should name the personnel but I am saying that the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) yesterday said that the Board's representation was being broadened to include a representative of the producers and the consumers and the distributors and a Judge.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. OLIVER: Surely we are entitled to have in the legislation that composition of the Board. Surely that should be in the legislation and not left to regulation. That is a sound argument. We can leave it for further discussion.

I want, for a moment or two to discuss the broad picture of the price of milk in the province of Ontario. The government, by this Bill, are giving the impression to the public that they are going to hold the line or reduce the price of milk. Anyone who read last night's papers ---

MR. FROST: I would say to the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) this, that there was nothing in the statements yesterday or today to give such an impression. If impressions have been created they are certainly not created either by the Bill or by the statement of thehon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) yesterday, nor the statements that were made today.

MR. OLIVER: Well, of course, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows q uite well that the papers last night said that the government had frozen the price of milk, "We have held the line, we are going to stop this thing from going up and getting out of control", and in that you have our sympathy and will have our support but I wanted to point out that in my opinion there are only three or four avenues through which we can even hold the price of milk let along reduce it in the province of Ontario. One of them, would of course be to cut the producers price irrespective of policy. I think we agree that that is an impossibility. At the present time the producers of milk in this province have, in my judgment made a great contribution to holding down the cost of living even to the point where it is today. If they had received for their efforts in the production of milk an increase in price comparable to that of other products the cost of living in this province would have been higher than it is at the present time. The farmer in producing milk today is faced with ever increasing cost-, the cost of his feed from which he provides the milk or by which he provides milk is going up all the time and I do not suppose we have reached the limit yet. The cost of labour

on the farm to help produce that milk is also rising so we can expect that the farmers' costs will go up rather than go down and I do not think we can even hold out the hope they will remain stationary and as these costs go up they must necessarily be reflected in the increase in the price he gets for the milk or else he is not going to keep on producing milk. That is an angle which I suggest it is out entirely. We cannot ask our producers in this province to take less for the milk than they are at the present time. The other one is the margin that the distributor gets for the task that is his in this whole picture. I do not know what that margin is, I do not know how much you could shrink it but I would venture the guess this afternoon that if you get down to your analysis and your cost finding, all that you could shrink your distributors margin will not be reflected very much in the lowering of the cost of milk in this province of Ontario.

Well now, another way that it can be done is for the government to institute a subsidy for milk in the province. That is a matter of government policy and it may be that in the province of Ontario that is the only way we can hold the line in the price of milk. However, that can be discussed again and I will not say anything more except to say that is the third way by which the price of milk can be held to a stationary basis in this province.

MR. FROST: There are two others.

MR. OLIVER: I was going to deal with one more. One more has been discussed this afternoon and that is the cash and carry proposition. This has some merits, Mr.Speaker,

I think the consuming public can be trained to buy its milk in larger containers and if they would get the habit of going to the store and picking it up, some savings could be accomplished there and that avenue is certainly worth exploring.

I suggest to the House this afternoon that in this amendment offered by the government to the Milk Control Act we are going back to a place we should not have left. We should not have passed those amendments in 1948, all that you have got as a result of the passing of those amendments has been chaos and disorder in the whole milk market in the province of Ontario. So far as I am concerned, I am happy at last that the government has retreated to the position abdicated in 1948. We are going to support second reading of the Bill.

There is one thing more I want to say to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy). There has just been set on our desks a notice that the agriculture committee meet Monday morning at 11:00 o'clock. I suggest seriously to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that this is not going to give us a chance for discussion before the agriculture committee meets. The trains of the rural members ---

MR. KENNEDY: Tuesday at 10:00 o'clock?

MR. FROST: All right?

MR. OLIVER: That is all right. Then, the case is completed.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St.Andrew): Mr. Speaker, the Bill that is before us as has been stated by previous speakers seeks to somewhat close the door after a great many horses have been stolen.

MR. PARK: Cows.

MR. SALSBERG: Everybody insists cows were stolen and I am not so sure that the cows were actually stolen but certainly a lot of milk was stolen from the mouths of many people who would have drunk that milk. The fact is, in 1948 the lock was not only removed but the door was opened wide for the stealing of cows and I am not one of those who likes to rub it in -- to use a colloquial expression --

MR. KENNEDY: Get started at it.

MR. SALSBERG: But I cannot help recalling the discussion when that Bill was before the House when I asked the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) if he did not realize that the dairies would be free to fix prices as they saw fit. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) for whom I have a very high personal regard, employed at that time the stratagem that he frequently employs, he sat there, he smiled and he said nothing, he just looked across and smiled. However, earlier in the discussion he did say he was confident that the process of collective bargaining would ensure the people a fair price on milk. Now, what was true then but was not realized by the government and is true today and must be taken account of by everyone is this, that where monopoly enters free competition is throttled completely. There can be no free competition when monopoly is there whether it is the dairy business or any other type of business. Monopoly means the fixing of prices and the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) and the government at that time did not sufficiently realize that they were dealing with a product that is handled primarily by a monopoly

which dominates the industry. That is why the mistake was made, that is why the Bill that they introduced at the time and which they undoubtedly believed to be an excellent way of solving the problem as it stood before them at the time. Unfortunately, it had to fail, it had to fail and it will fail in any form in which it may be introduced again without realizing that government action is necessary to curb monopoly.

Now then, the Bill at present before us seeks to accomplish two main objectives, that is, to protect the producer and to protect the consumer. That is the underlying motive of the Bill. Accepting that to be the case, I am obliged to say at this stage that the government will not be able to offer that protection unless they go a step further. I agree fully with what the hon. Member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) has said that the producer, the farmer, must be protected, he cannot and should not be expected to work without proper remuneration and without the profit that he is entitled to. We all agree to that.

Now, if the government feels that way too -- and I am sure they do -- then we must realize that the farm price will be determined by many factors that the farmers have no control over. Insofar as the distribution end of it is concerned, certainly the dairy workers have to be protected, men and women employed in the dairy industry who have families to support, have to buy groceries and other necessities of life in the market that they do not control and they have to earn enough to support their families. That leaves the profit angle of the

of the distributing part of the industry to tackle. Well, I think that should be coped with, that should be looked into. If one or two dairies can show a profit of 50% as the government now reveals --

MR. FROST: Oh, there is no foundation for such a statement.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) says there is no foundation I will be obliged to say that the statement emanating from a government department and appearing in this afternoon's paper is incorrect. I am merely repeating what I read a few minutes ago.

MR. KENNEDY: What government statement is that, I have not seen that.

MR. SALSBERG: It is not a government paper to my knowledge, it is the Toronto Daily Star.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: It says, I am now quoting from The Toronto Star of today, the story is carried on the front page of the paper and carrying the by-line of one of the most respected newspaper men in the profession and the senior member of the Press Gallery, Groy Greenaway:

> "Reports from Ontario Milk Board auditors who have been investigating dairies in the Belleville district show "startling" profits by some of the dairies, high Ontario government officials stated today. It is estimated that instead of selling for 20 cents a quart in Belleville, 18 cents or less would show a fair profit.

> Profits of two dairies were described as 'handsome'. Auditors' reports show net profits well over 50 per cent., but one dairy was found to be barely breaking even.
>
> Price to be frozen
>
> These reports were received as Hon. W. A. Goodfellow, Minister of Welfare, announced that the price of milk would be frozen throughout Ontario".

I say, Mr. Speaker, that whether the facts are entirely as reported or not is secondary for the purpose of this disucssion. What I merely meant to say was that the dairy industry is controlled by monopoly, that section of the dairy industry is profiteering, and that certainly steps should be taken to curb such profiteering.

Here is the main point I wish to make in this discussion and it will only take me a minute or two. Regardless of what may be done we will not solve the problem without the government undertaking to subsidize the price of milk.

(TAKE "F" FOLLOWS)

(TAKE UP* EDITION)

.nd I place it not merely as a question, but as a definite suggestion. There is no other way. If we want to protect the farmers -- which we do; if we want to protect the dairy workers -- which we do; then we must resort to a subsidy.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the subsidy on milk should have been instituted a few years ago, and certainly we can lose no time in bringing this about. The freezing of the price of milk is a welcome step, but that will not solve the problem. That is an opinion, by the way, which has been expressed inside and outside of this House. A few days ago, Mr. Speaker, the delegation representing 200,000 members of the Trade Unions affiliated with the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada in this province, asked the government to subsidize milk, and keep it at a reasonable level. That demand has also been made on the government by the association of housewives, the Consumers' Leagues, and so forth. I was glad the hon. House Leader of the Liberal Group (Mr. Oliver) raised the question, although he was not very emphatic on it, and did not indicate whether he was for it or against it, but he raised it.

I believe large numbers of farmers are in favour. We must not lose sight of the fact that the consumption of milk has dropped every time the price of milk went up. Last Fall, when the price of milk rose again, a spokesman for the Toronto Welfare Council said;"in 1946, when milk cost 11 cents a quart, the average person in Toronto drank 16 glasses a week, while today he drank only 11 glasses per week".

MR. KENNEDY: And there is 3% more milk sold in Toronto today than last year.

MR. SALSBER: I suppose the per capita consumption of milk probably dropped after the increase last Fall. If there is an increase in the total sales, it may reflect merely the increase in population, but the trend, Mr. Speaker, is inevitably and invariably the same; you raise the price of milk and down comes the consumption.

I say that a subsidy is necessary for two reasons; first, the health reason. It is one of the most essential of foods, as the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) has so ably pointed out year in and year out in the House and outside of the House, and I agree with him. I happen to be a person who likes milk; in fact, I prefer it to other liquids -- most other liquids.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: I think we should subsidize milk so as to bring it down by at least five cents a quart imm ediately. In doing so, we will increase the consumption of milk, and make it possible for the children of this province, and their mothers, to consume the full amount of this basic food, which is required.

Secondly, we must subsidize milk by at least 5 cents a quart for economic reasons, to protect the producers which, by the way, will also mean his market will not shrink, but will expand. It will guarantee to him a fair price, and it will protect the Dairy workers.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have to take that step, the essential step -- in solving this critical problem that is before the people, and unless we take that step, we will fail entirely to solve it.

Freezing is all right, but it is only a temporary measure. When the farmers find that the cost of feed

goes up they will have to ask for an increase, freeze or no freeze. If you pass it on to the consumer you will merely reduce the consumption. Subsidy is the only way out.

The question may be put to me whether Ottawa or Ontario should assume the responsibility. I am of the opinion that Ottawa should. I think the Liberal Government at Ottawa was entirely wrong when it removed the milk subsidy. But we are confronted with a "hard-necked government" in Ottawa, --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: Insofar as it concerns -- in recent times particularly -- social obligations. When they fail to do what is necessary, I say this province -- and I will paraphrase the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) and say this great province, this rich province, and this government which enjoys the fruits of the prosperity in this province, must assume that responsibility. You cannot say that if Ottawa refuses to do it, you will not assume it.

I think a subsidy is necessary, that a 5 cent subsidy is the way out at the moment. It will offer protection to all the basic elements involved in the industry. It will, at the same time, make possible an increased consumption of milk.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex North): If I may direct a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) - yesterday when the Bill was introduced, I asked the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) whether or not this freezing of the price of milk will apply to the increase which goes into effect in Windsor, Friday, March 16th, amounting to one cent a quart.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) replied that it did not affect that increase.

I read now in Clause 1 of Section 10, and the freezing date is March 15th -- yesterday. So I again ask the question whether this will affect the increase which has gone into effect in Windsor.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the date was set at midnight on the 14th of March, to meet the Windsor situation. It may not. On the other hand, our position must be this, that we cannot let some particular situation stand in the way of the interest of all the people. This Bill will be through within a very few days, and the Board can immediately deal with that case, if it does not come under the exceptions in the Act. If that situation arises, they can deal with it, and I do not think anybody will be very badly hurt. In any event, we have to accept conditions, and we have to pass legislation in the interest of all the people, and if this cuts across some little segment, the Board can then deal with it.

MR. SALSBERG: Would the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) say a word about the proposal for subsidies?

MR. FROST: I presume there are no others who want to talk --

MR. FOLLIFTE: Yes, there is at least one other.

MR. T. H. ISLEY (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take part in this debate, in regard to this long-looked-for baby. I think one of the first things we should take into consideration is the rising cost. The hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) dealt with the rising cost on the production of milk,

and with a ceiling on the price of milk, I myself cannot see how the producer can go on producing milk under the present twenty cent ceiling. I am not in favour of milk going any higher. Do not misunderstand me.

One of the things I would like to point out is that the milk producers always know they must keep their costs of production down, and I think the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) said this afternoon that is one of the things that is always taken into consideration, that we must keep the cost of our products down, somewhere near a sum which the public can pay for that product.

But today, with the ever increasing cost of feed and labour, what puzzles me is how the producer of milk who is going to be caught in this squeeze, will fair out with a ceiling. I think it is too bad we have not had this Bill previous to this time today so that the producers would have given some indication as to what they expect in future amendments to this Bill.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has mentioned cattle being sold in the United States. If cattle are being sold to the United States, at least we know they are going there for a productive purpose, for breeding purposes, although they are leaving this country. But the thing that bothers me is the number of auction sales of dairy herds being held, expecially in the last month, where speculators have gone to buy cows for beef. As some of the hon. members probably know, the auction sales are held when the cows are near freshening so that

they will bring a better price. The speculators attend these sales and get together, and say, "We will pay so much", or "this cow is worth that much for beef".

In one case called to my attention, out of 18 head, 16 went to the slaughter house. They were good dairy cows. That is one thing that this government should have stepped in on and tried to give the producers some encouragement as to where to go from here, also to prevent sales of these breed animals for slaughter.

The subject has been covered pretty well by previous speakers, but I would like to point out there are two glaring omissions in the principles of this Bill. One of them, of course, is the old subject of "pooling". Going back over the years, in the farm Forums, we have discussed the pooling of milk. There is one doubt which always enters into the minds of the farmers, that is whether the surplus milk is assigned properly, and used as such and whether the dairy is giving him a proper percentage at fluid milk price or whether the distributor is cheating him , paying surplus milk price for first grade milk.

Take, for instance, a producer for the Toronto market, never meets the people to whom he is selling the milk, and he has no way of knowing what the people are doing with his milk, therefore, there is always in the back of his mind the thought that probably he is being cheated on the amount of surplus being paid to him. We have discussed this year after year, right across this province, and we feel that if we could set up a central "pooling" system for a certain market, milk could be trucked into that central place, the

the distributor then could purchase his milk from that central place, and the producer could be paid according to the amount of milk that is being sold for table use, manufacturing, etc.

(TAKE "G" FOLLOWS)

I think until we come down to that type of system there is going to be grave doubt in the minds of the producers. If the percentage of milk going into bottles can be set by the Pool, then the producer would know that he is being treated fairly. I think that is one of the things that is being overlooked in this Bill. It is one of the things that I think will work in the interests of not only the producers but it would take away the headache and the trouble of surplus milk from the dairies. After all, there is no producer so narrow minded that he does not agree that the processor or distributor should make a reasonable profit. We all agree on that. We all believe in making profits. We certainly have doubt as producers, at times, especially when one sees such statements in the press as have been read into the record by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr.Salsberg). dealing with dairies profits. Those are the type of articles that put the producers in the position that they do not know whether they should go on producing milk or go out of the milk business and into the business which is paying larger dividends at the time, and that is, of course, the beef business. So, I think that in the interests of the producer, the processor, and the consumer as well, a pooling system right across this province would prove out very successfully. I would like this government to take one area and set it aside on a trial basis and try that type of system to see how it would work out.

Another point which has been omitted in this Bill, another principle, is that of cooperative trucking. We all realize that where a group of people band themselves together in any organization in a legal way they should be given a right to serve their membership. Although this has been mentioned before we know that the producers of milk in many areas feel they could cut down on the cost of gathering milk if they were to have a cooperative system of gathering it. I am thinking of one particular area where there are no less than between

seven and ten trucks each morning gathering milk, driving over the same milk producing area for three different markets. True, you would have to have one truck for each market, but I do think that one truck gathering milk over a certain area is all the transportation needed for gathering milk for one particular market. I am sure that under a cooperative set-up you could eliminate the duplication of services in that respect. I am certain that is something that deserves the attention of this House and of the hon. members who meet in Committee. I think it deserves discussion in Committee because I think it has wonderful possibilities.

I would like to say a word about the repealing of section 14 of the Act. That is the matter which worries many of the small operators of dairies. Previous mention has been made of monopolies moving in and crowding the small dairies out. That I see as one great danger and I ho pe that is not going to happen. I realize, having regard to the statement the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has made that they, the government want more competition among dairies but I am just wondering whether we are going to have more competition or probably less. I am a bit worried about that. It is another thing which deserves very careful consideration, because, as the small dairies get fewer and the large dairies get stronger, the demands of the distributors will carry more pressure behind them and I am not too happy when an area is thrown open to all dairies as proposed by the repeal of section 1 4. I am thinking in particular of the small dairy in a town adjoining a large city where one or more dairies are situated. If this area is going to be thrown open I am just wondering what is going to happen to those small dairies which are trying to compete now. True, we do not want to protect anyone who is not an efficient operator. I do not think we should protect an ineffecient operator, but I think there are other ways in

which we can bring about efficiency in the distribution system with respect to milk. I feel that there are many other ways we can do it without repealing section 14 of this Act which has proven down through the years to be of some value. Furthermore, that is one of the recommendations in Mr. Justice Wells' report, that is, that this section remain as is. The hon. Mr. Justice Wells recommended that very highly.

I will look forward, along with all other hon. members,to this Bill getting thorough discussion at the Committee stage, at the Agricultural Committee. I did not understand the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) when he made mention of the time on Tuesday when this Bill would be dealt with in Agriculture Committee.

MR. KENNEDY: Tuesday at 10:00 o'clock.

MR. ISLEY: We will certainly look forward to thorough discussion on this Bill.

I do hope that in the interests of all our people right across this province we put into this Bill everything we feel is in the interests to the public. I am thinking very seriously of the consuming public because, after all, the more milk the consuming public can use the more milk it means I can produce on my farm. It is the volume today we need in farm production. We have arrived at the point where if we are making a small margin of profit and can have sufficient volume we are not too badly off; but, unless we have that volume of production we sometimes find ourselves engaged in a losing proposition. One of the things I certainly hope is that we can sit down and discuss this Bill and write into the Bill which is before this House, in Agriculture Committee or otherwise, such things as will do the best for the entire population of this Country, because, as the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) has said, it is one of our most important foods. We do not want to deprive

anyone of the food and we do not want to see any person producing milk unless it affords him a profitable return.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Isley) mentioned the great duplication on these trunk roads in the country. I notice the report of the hon. Mr. Justice Wells stated that they estimated at that time there was a duplication each day of 3,324 unnecessary miles of routes in the country to bring the milk into this city alone. That was costing an additional $120,000. If you think there is duplication in the picking up of the milk in the country you ought to see some of our streets in the city of Toronto where the distribution takes place. There you have from five to ten milk wagons on the same street the same day. The city of Toronto only has 500 miles of street and yet we have the average milk wagon, the average truck, travelling anywhere from 30 to 35 miles a day. The horse drawn travels from seven to ten or twelve miles a day. There undoubtedly is overlapping of distribution. When we see in the paper a short time ago where a Mr. George Graham from Belleville, a man with 25 years of dairy experience, a man who has a farm composed of over 1,000 acres and a herd of over 275 head, a man who says that he can save consumers four to five cents a quart by a cash and carry plan of picking the milk up from a depot, I think that should be investigated. In the United States they do a great deal of milk selling from depots. I know in Detroit and Chicago and, to a lesser extent, New York City, a good deal of milk is sold in gallon jars where the consumer comes to a depot and brings home a jar of milk, two or three days' supply. I think that should be investigated.

I would like to deal with the question of subsidy for a moment. I agree with the hoh. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver)

that a subsidy should be considered even at the provincial level. We had a subsidy at the federal level during the war and that subsidy worked, I think, very well; but that subsidy was also assisted by a subsidy on barley and on oats. The subsidy on barley was $12.40 a ton and the subsidy on oats was $5.88 a ton. That subsidy was taken off in October, 1947 and two days afterwards the government unwisely opened the Winnipeg Grain Exchange to course grain. What happened to the Eastern farmer when that happened? Mind you, this did not affect the price to the western farmer, who already, in the main, had sold his grain that year, but the eastern farmer in a few days found his prices were up $35. a ton for feed grain in the fall of 1947. It was estimated that a profit of $25 million was reaped in a matter of weeks in speculation on oats and barley, on the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. It was the Eastern Ontario farmer who paid that shot. I t was the consumer in Ontario who paid the shot, also.

I believe that there is room in the business of milk distribution to save both the farmer and the consumer by a unified system of distribution. The hon. Mr. Justice Wells' Commission had some evidence given to it by a former head of one of the largest milk distributors in Toronto. He suggested a three cent saving per quart of milk could be effected by unified distribution methods in the city of Toronto.

I come to the final point I wish to make and that is the promise of the government that they will put on this Milk Board a representative of consumers, of producers and of distributors. I welcome the addition of consumers to that representation.

Some years ago you promised more than that; you promised you were going to put on the Board a representative of Veterans and a representative of Labour. You never did get around to carrying out that promise.

MR. KENNEDY: Who did? I never remember hearing of that.

MR. DENNISON: You remember the famous 22 points? That was actually one of the famous 22 points.

MR. KENNEDY: I do not remember a thing about what the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) is talking about.

MR. DENNISON: Those famous 22 points seem to pop up and kick this government on the seat of the pants every session.

MR. PORTER: About all you have left to talk about.

MR. DENNISON: Those 22 points composed a remarkable document. Back in 1943 we had the Tories backed right up against the wall. They knew the CCF was going to win that election in 1943.

MR. PORTER: What happened in 1945?

MR. DENNISON: So, Mr. Drew, without consulting some of the boys ---

MR. DUNBAR: You went out the window in 1945.

MR. DENNISON: You won by misrepresentation. In fact, in 1 943, you had to win on your platform. In 1943 you were backed up against the wall. You realized the CCF was going to win that election unless you did something. George Drew, the Prime Minister, apparently, without letting the rest of you read it, presented this programme which contained a great deal of our programme. You boys have been disowning it ever since.

Let me read what George Drew promised back in 1943. This is the very favourite newspaper of the administration. This is reprinted from the Globe and Mail, and this was put out by you people. This is not a forgery, or anything like that; it was put out as a reprint of the Globe and Mail in 1943, just prior to the election. This is what point No. 19 said:

> "Adequate supplies at reasonable prices of fuel, milk and other basic necessities will be assured

> by effective organization and administrative control. Representatives of labour, veteran organizations and the consuming public will be appointed to all Boards dealing with these matters."

The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) forgets that. I hope that he will not forget the promises he made just after the Wells Report was presented to this province. I trust he will not forget those promises. I would ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) if he remembers the promise that he was going to bring in legislation to allow municipalities to establish municipal distribution? It is here. It may be embarrassing to hear this. I wonder if the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) remembers that he also said that the Wells Royal Commission Report was the best thing that has ever happened.

MR. KENNEDY: I say nice things about a lot of things -- even you, sometimes.

MR. DENNISON: You certainly do.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is really a gentleman. He hates to say "no" to you but, when your back is turned, he does the same thing as if he said "no". That is the worst of it; he does it in such a nice way you really get cheated without knowing you are being cheated.

MR. KENNEDY: I am going to do that with you right now.

MR. DENNISON: The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is quoted on October 20, 1947 as follows:

> "Hon. T.L. Kennedy, Ontario Minister of Agriculture, today said 'temporary amendments to the present Ontario Milk Control Act' will be introduced when the Ontario Legislature meets, starting

Wednesday."

That was right before the session.

"One of these amendments will be to give the Milk Control Board power to fix the price of milk, as recommended by Mr. Justice Wells, Mr. Kennedy said. Another amendment which will probably be introduced will give dairies the power to sell at a lower price, if they so desire, he declared."

The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) promised this legislation a long time ago.

"Mr. Justice Wells' report said many large dairies in Ontario could even now sell at lower prices and still make a legitimate profit.

Mr. Kennedy also predicted that the Municipal Act will probably be amended to permit the municipalities to go into the milk business 'if they so desire'."

(TAKE "H" FOLLOWS)

MR. DENNISON: In the Fall of 1947, despite the fact that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) had just previously, told Brantford their Milk Bill was dead, their Milk Bill for Municipal Distribution of Milk which had been passed and voted on by the people of Brantford, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) told them their Milk Bill was dead.

MR. DUNBAR: It was not a plebiscite, and I told you today according to the Municipal Act the Municipal Board gave the power to give any municipality the provision to sell milk as a utility, just the same as others, could get into the milk business.

MR. DENNISON: You know very well at the hearing down in Committee Room No. 1, at the meeting down there, the Mayor of Brantford stood up and said: "I do not care whether you insist on taxes being paid or not, we agree to that, but we have rights under the Ontario Municipal Board and under the present Municipal Act we have a right to set up this dairy and all we are asking for is the right given to us under the Act".

MR. DUNBAR: And do you remember him saying it was not his baby, he did not want to speak on it because it was not his baby.

MR. DENNISON: Yes, but he said he was supporting it in the interest of the people and you are the person who took the responsibility of destroying what the majority had voted for.

MR. DUNBAR: No plebiscite.

MR. DENNISON: Now, the point I want to come to is now we have another promise. In 1948 this right to have a consumer representative on the Milk Control

Board was taken away. The present Chairman of the Hydro, Mayor Bob Saunders, when he was Mayor of Toronto, was the representative on the Milk Control Board and Bob went up there and on two occasions -- I remember he was on that Board in the interests of the consumers and I would say of the present promise, I wonder, will it be observed because, you know you have always had the power, that power was never taken away from you in the existing Act, you have the power to appoint a consumer representative on the Milk Control Board. Well, why have we not got one?

And now, I believe that this is a problem which affects the producers, it affects the distributors, it affects the working men who is distributing milk for the distributors and it is in the interests of everyone concerned that we reduce the price between the producer and the consumer. Now, a short time ago I noticed that the spread -- I have the clipping here some place -- the spread in market prices today in our large Ontario cities is very, very large, it runs possibly from 8 cents to 9 cents spread. Now, during the war, that spread was kept down a bit because we had several subsidies. I want to remind the hon. members of the House, particularly the hon. members of the Liberal Party who I know do not agree with what Ottawa did at that time, I know they were just as shocked at what the Government did in 1946 as anyone else, but in 1946, before Ottawa Liberal Government decided to blow the lid off, the motion of a C.C.F. member, had passed by 65 votes to 55 votes, a motion requesting that milk subsidies bekept on at the Federal level.

MR. MILLARD: That is what they tried last night.

MR. DENNISON: That is right, we caught the members one night with a lot of members out and the motion passed the House of Common, the House of Commons officially approved the continuation of milk subsidies and despite that fact, the Federal Government abolished milk subsidies in the Fall of 1947 and up went the price of milk. I think this Legislature can do a good job on this. I will support the Bill in the Agricultural Committee. I hope the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) will bring in these amendments and I hope we get these things settled once and for all.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I just say a word in concluding this debate. I was much interested in what the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) said About the increase in the costs of the farmer or the producer, the increase in labour costs and the obvious cost increases in the case of the distributor. Now, our position here is to see that the consumer gets a fair break in the matter of his class. That is the purpose of this Act. Actually speaking we are faced with these things, there is no possibility of a reduction on price or even a price freeze. The fact is that these matters have to be made in an orderly and fair way and see that all of those interests are properly protected.

The second point raised was in connection with Section 14. I would ask the hon. member to look at Section No. 6, I do not think in this Act as drawn that the repeal of Section 14 has the same effect as

in the previous Bill. I must admit I had many doubts in the previous Bill about repeal of Section 14. I quite frankly failed to see how milk that is perhaps in a lower price area can compete fairly with milk in a higher price area. That would destroy the representations of the Act and be most unfair to the producer. Now, that is a matter the Committee can consider. I had very grave doubts about that situation and so did the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy). But, the matter as it was drawn up was to see if there was a possibility of increasing competition in the various areas. And now, I have dealt with that this afternoon. We came to the conclusion that it would not, we came to the conclusion that it would really do damage. Now, after the present situation and the repal of Section 14, I think we have an open mind on that question.

And now, Mr. Speaker, concerning the subsidy for milk, I might say that subsidy for milk must be with the Federal authorities. The taxing powers, the taxing structures of the province will never permit this unless they give the province indirect sales tax and a lot of other things.

MR. NIXON: Liquor taxes.

MR. FROST: That is right, if that were done there may be some possibility of the financial strength to do it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Did you mention sales tax?

MR. FROST: Well, there is talk, many of the provinces are asking for indirect sales tax, you would have to have indirect sales tax plus a lot of other taxing powers than we have not got now to start any

such thing as an interference with the economic structures of the country. I would add, subsidies, could not be any more unsound, nothing could lead to disaster quicker than provinces or municipalities getting mixed up in that sort of thing. The fact is, from the standpoint of the economics of this case, we are far better this day within our own power and mind our own business.

If subsidies are needed as they were during the war, they are strictly a Federal matter. They have the great over-all taxing power; they control the economy of the country; theycan direct things, and our intervention in that particular field may or may not parallell what is being done by the central government, and it leads to difficulties.

My feeling is that there are far better ways for the Legislature of the province of Ontario to give assistance to our people than to get into the field of price fixing and price control, from the standpoint of subsidies, which would have no end. It would really be, as far as we are concerned in the province, like throwing a pebble into the ocean. It would have no real effect, and cost us a great amount of money, far beyond the power of the municipalities to pay.

That is all I have to say in connection with this Bill, which I am glad to say has won the unanimous commendation of the House.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply. This is for the purpose of dealing with this supplementary estimate which I think should be dealt with today. It will not take very long¾

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order -- and I stand to be corrected, if I am wrong; should there not be a motion of reference to the Committee?

MR. KENNEDY: We have done this many times before, as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) well knows.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think it should be done, because the Committee should report back to the House.

MR. FROST: I would move the Bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture, with the direction to report to the House.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I move you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolves itself into a Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

THE HOUSE IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (Mr. Patrick in the Chair):

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, on the desks of hon. members is a supplementary estimate, Vote 197, for the fiscal year ended 31st of March, 1951, a provision for payment for a special grant to public general hospitals, under the authority of The Public Hospitals' Act, and regulations thereunder, amount to $1,500,000.

I will give you the history of this estimate.

Going back many years, the amount paid to public general hospitals was only on an indigent basis. Back in 1943, it was 60 cents per indigent day only, and for indigent cases. That was raised a year or so later to 75 cents a day, and then in 1947 we introduced the public ward bed grant, for the first time. In 1948, you will recall we increased this grant in the Budget of that year, by 231%. The ceiling in 1947 was $1 per day for every public ward bed, in the class "A" hospitals, graded down to the other hospitals.

In 1948, we increased that by 231%, making the class "A" hospitlas $2.35, graded down for the "B", "C" and "D" hospitals.

From a standpoint of actual paying, if you translate what we did onto the public ward bed basis to indigency in terms of what was done previous to 1947, actually we have been paying to the hospitals more than the full indigent costs, if you take the number of indigent days and divide that into our grant on the basis of the old 60 cent grant, it worked out to, I believe, $8 to $9. a day. I have the figures some place, but they are not material now. So actually the problem has come to us in this way; some of the hospitals were complaining about their indigent costs. The question came up as to whether we should translate all of our payments, abandoning the public ward bed basis, and going onto a straight indigent basis. I have thought that would be an undesirable step, because it would lay emphasis on indigency, and I do not think it would add to the efficiency of a hospital. I think it would be an encouragement for the hospital to treat cases as indigent cases, which is not desirable.

There would not be any break in the municipal estimates in that case, and I would say to the hon. members of the House that is a very important point. If the municipality feels there is not some responsibility to itself in regard to the matter of admissions to the hospitals, everybody becomes indigent, and they become a real problem, and we have to face it. I thought it was better to give up assistance on the public ward bed basis, even though it did open us to the suggestion that we were not paying indigent costs. Actually we are paying more than the indigent costs in Ontario today, that is, from a provincial government standpoint.

However, we went on and raised the public ward bed grants to $2.35, and graded it down, which will be of tremendous assistance to the hospitals.

I had a deputation here from Kingston seeing me about the Kinston Hospital, and they told me the maintenant grant we are giving them was what really enabled them to carry on. That is true of any hospitals in Ontario. Six million dollars or seven million dollars is being put directly into maintenance grants every year, and that is a factor which is not only saving, but bettering the hospitals' position in Ontario.

We felt that perhaps we should add to our public ward bed grant's system an indigent factor, giving to the hospitals something for their indigent costs, and in figuring out the formula -- which is quite complicated, as it has to be -- we figure the amount of our grants per bed, assuming that each indigent bed is taking our grants, plus the municipal payments, plus

an amount which would make up to the hospital what appeared to be about the average required to take care of the indigents. So we have retained all the safety factors and all the desirable factors, and yet we give to our hospitals enough assistance which will substantially take care of the problems with which our municipalities and hospitals are faced.

Last year I was very anxious that a Bill be introduced permitting a more orderly payment to the hospitals, which would be effected in 1950 but, strange to say, the one we most wanted to benefit -- the Toronto General -- objected, but I think they did not understand what was taking place, and they did themselves out of a very considerable sum of money, and we found it necessary to make it effective January 1st, 1951.

We have now, instead of the old, unscientific, straight payments across the board, according to the type of hospital, "A", "B", "C", and "D" we have introduced this indigent factor, which will mean we will pay to public hospitals about one and one-half million dollars, before April 1st of this year, and following April 1st, we will give them a further grant of the same amount, to apply in the year 1951-1952, so this year they will get two grants in the one year, plus the increased municipal payments which went through this House last session.

As to the formula; I have a memorandum here from Mr. Telfer, the Chief Inspector of Hospitals, which I will read in part:

> " Further to my previous memos of the 13th, the Prime Minister has requested additional information, explaining

the method of arriving at the three supplementary rates payable to groups "A", "B" and "C" hospitals.

In group "A" hospitals, the average daily cost per public ward patient day in 1950 amounted to $9.73 excluding depreciation on buildings. The combined statutory municipal grant of $3., and the provincial bed subsidy of $2.35, making a total of $5.35, leaves a difference of $4.38, which, on the basis of this calculation, re-presents the loss on each indigent patient day".

(TAKE "J" FOLLOWS)

One-third of this figure, namely, $1.46, was recommended for payment to Group A hospitals.

In Group B hospitals the average cost per indigent patient day for 1950 amounted to $9.18. The combined statutory municipal rate of $2.50 and the maximum Provincial bed subsidy of $1.76, making a total of $4.26, leaves a difference of $4.92. One-third of this figure, namely, $1.64, was recommended for payment to Group B hospitals.

In Group C hospitals the average cost per indigent patient day for 1950 amounted to $7.50. The combined statutory municipal rate of $2.25 and the maximum Provincial bed subsidy of $1.41, making a total of $3.66, leaves a difference of $3.84. One-third of this figure, namely, $1.28, was recommended as a supplementary payment

(J 2 FOLLOWS)

to Group C hospitals.

MR. DENNISON: This is the loss.

MR. FROST: Yes, it works out at $1.64 in B hospitals and $1.28 on the C hosptials, so the regulations that will come into effect will give to the hospitals rectoactively over the last fiscal year the varying amounts of $1.46, $1.64 and $1.28 for the A, B and C hospitals respectively over the last year, and the new regulations and the Estimates that you will consider from the Department of Health will take care of a similar amount after April 1st.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I recommend this matter to the consideration of the House and we would like to have this Estimate passed so that cheques may be sent out to the hospitals at once. We would like to get those payments out before the 31st of March.

I may say that the payment of that amount is anticipated in the Budget which was presented, and is included in the estimated expenditures for this fiscal year.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, I understood from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that the hospitals still will not get quite that difference.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. DENNISON: They will get most of it but will still have to carry a little bit of a loss.

MR. FROST: That is right, but may I point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Dennison) that on the other hand there is this to consider, that taking for instance a class A hospital with 100 public ward beds, it gets $2.35 across the board for each one of those beds. Then,

on the indigent beds, while there is some loss on those, nevertheless it gets from us $1.46 plus the municipal contribution on that indigent bed, so that it really ought to leave our hospitals in very reasonable shape.

MR. DENNISON: I am sure the hospitals will welcome this addition. I drew this to the attention of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) when I spoke on the Throne Debate. At that time I said I could not understand how we were asking a municipality in which there is a Class A hospital -- which includes most of the municipalities with hospitals in the province -- to put up $2.00, and get $2.35 from the government.

MR. FROST: Of course their payment is only on the indigent bed, and ours is on all the beds.

MR. DENNISON: Yes. I see there is introduced an innovation in presenting the Budget. The $1,500,000 we have in the Budget for next year has now been shunted back to --

MR. FROST: No, we pay that also.

MR. DENNISON: And this $1,500,000 will be for the 1951-52

MR. FROST: The 1951 budget.

MR. DENNISON: That is right.

MR. FROST: There will be two payments, that is right.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Chairman, this is entirely without any relation to any matching Federal grant?

MR. FROST: That is right, there is no Federal grant that corresponds with that. I have taken this

matter up, have presented this view to the Federal Government on several occasions, to the hon. Mr. Martin.

There is no sounder approach that the Federal Government could make to the hospital problem in Ontario -- and I assume in the other provinces, but certainly in Ontario -- than a public ward grant, a bed grant after thefashion of our grant. As you know, we pioneered in the matter of the capital grants, and the Federal Government in 1948 followed our system of capital grants. If the Federal Government were to give a grant per public ward bed to the hospitals of Canada, to the hospitals of Ontario, nothing I think that could be done would stimulate more greatly hospital building and the extension of our hospitals according to that feature.

I have advanced that view to the hon. Mr. Martin and I think that in the Federal grants for health there are many things that might be written off in favor of that feature. I think more would be accomplished than many of the things that are in the Federal grants system.

Vote 197 agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report a certain resolution.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report one resolution and moves its adoption; and begs leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Speaker,

I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would care to tell us when we might expect some action on Bill No. 116, An Act to amend the Farm Products Marketing Act -- more or less a companion Act to the one we were dealing with today. Could we have some idea when it might be coming up?

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): May I say to my hon. friend (Mr. Millard) that there are some matters which are pressing and which we are anxious to get ahead with, and it may be that the Bill he mentioned may be delayed until after Easter. Obviously, there is not the same urgency for a matter of a few days involved with that Bill as in the one we dealt with this afternoon.

On Monday, Mr. Speaker, we will go ahead initially at least with some of the Bills on the Order Paper, and then into Estimates. I am not sure whether there will be a night session on Monday, but I will let hon. members know in lots of time on Monday about that. We are planning night sessions on Tuesday and Wednesday, with an adjourment, as you know, on Wednesday until the following Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.53 of the clock p.m.

- - - - -

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

———•———

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

———•———

Volume XXXIII

Monday, March 19th, 1951.

———•———

The House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: May I advise the members of the Municipal Law Committee that a meeting of that Committee will not be held to-morrow morning but rather on Wednesday morning at ten o'clock. That is because the Agricultural Committee meets to-morrow at ten.

Through the generosity of the hon. Prime Minister and Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) it may afford some relief to the hon. members to know that they will receive a cheque for $1,000. - if you have that in your account- on your indemnity, either to-morrow or Wednesday.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: I do feel we should welcome back the hon. Minister of Public Works and Highways (Mr.Doucett)

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: After his illness, I know we are all delighted to see that he is able to be back in his place, and may I suggest that his absence be taken into consideration when his estimates are called.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I had it in my mind and heart to say that it is pleasing indeed to see the hon. Minister of Public Works and Highways (Mr. Doucett) with us again. I think he looks very well, whatever his doctor or his colleagues may tell him. He may have had a better time in his absence from this House than if he had been here. I am just wondering if the misfortune which struck him down so early in the session, and kept him away so long, was not perhaps happily timed, and if some of his colleagues would take a leaf out of his book,

they might save themselves a lot of trouble and win much undeserved sympathy from the Opposition.

MR. FROST: I am glad to agree with what has been said today and to welcome back the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) and also the hon. Minister for Hydro (Mr. Challies), who came here for a day or so and then unfortunately, had a relapse.

I am glad they look so well, and that their vacant seats have been filled again.

I am sorry that the hon. member ofr Woodbine (Mr. Leavens) still seems to be ill and unable to be with us. We hope before the end of the Session, we will have the pleasure of having him back.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He hopes to be back next week.

MR. FROST: It will be a great pleasure to have them all back.

MISS MACPHAIL: Mr. Speaker, may I ask, since you used the word "generosity" if that indicates we are to get an extra $1,000. to-morrow.

MR. KENNEDY: You will get the $3,000. on Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: I think I should say it was hard enough to get the $1,000.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introductionsof bills.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Approve an Agreement between Canada and Ontario with Respect

to the Development on the Niagara River", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. W. A. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): May I ask the hon. Minister if that is complementary to the other one he introduced.

MR. CHALLIES: Yes. It gives the continuity of legislative authority for work on the Niagara river. The agreement with the Federal Government has been signed and legislative action taken. This consolidates the aggeement between Ontario and the Dominion Government, and Bill No. 177 deals with the Government of Ontario and The Hydro Electric Power Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day; on Friday afternoon I gave notice of a night session to-night, but I find it is not convenient to a large section of the Opposition so there will be no night session to-night, but there will be night session to-morrow and Wednesday. I hope we will be able to so order things that it will not be necessary to go beyond eleven o'clock to-morrow night.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the best order to be followed would be to use the first hour of the day for bills, and the balance of the time for estimates, and if possible we might go unto estimates about three o'clock.

This afternoon, I would like to finish up the estimates of the Department of Education, and then the estimates of the Department of Reform Institutions, which the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail) wanted called

in the afternoon. May I give the order for today, in the hope of arranging matters so we can proceed in an orderly way. I would like to cover as many of the estimates as possible before the Easter recess. After Easter, we have some very important bills, the election act, the rent control and some other legislation including the matter relating to telephones. We should be able to deal with those in the matter not too rushed. It may be that the committee meeting in connection with the election act will satisfy all of the hon. members, and we will not need to spend the amount of time which, at first glance, seemed to be required. If we do save time, there are a number of hon. members who perhaps would be glad to have the session terminate.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): When will you proceed with the budget debate?

MR. FROST: Oh, I had forgotten that. We will have to complete that also next week.

MR. OLIVER: Are you going on to it to-morrow?

MR. FROST: No, I had not thought of going on with the budget address until after Easter. I think we should take the estimates together, and complete the budget debate after Easter.

MR. T. H. ISLEY(Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to rise to pay tribute to a man who has given great service to his country, a man who served in this House for four terms. It was with a great shock that I heard over the newscast at noon to-day that Mr. Karl K. Homuth passed on rather suddenly. I say it was a shock because it was just a short

while ago, at a home and school meeting that we met and had a good discussion on current affairs. So it came to me as a great shock, although I heard last night that Mr. Homuth was seriously ill.

He was first elected to this House as a Labor man in 1919, and then changed over to the Conservative Party which, at that time, I suppose he felt was the right thing to do, and he was re-elected three times after that. I think I am speaking for my group, and in fact all the hon. members of this House when I say we wish to extend to Mrs. Homuth and the immediate family our sincere sympathy in their bereavement.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo,North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Isley) in expressing the very sincere regret of this group upon the passing of one who I considered a very close personal friend, in the person of Mr. Karl Homuth. He will be missed trememdously as a public citizen of Canada, and as a citizen of the town of Preston.

We also wish to extend our sincere sympathy to his widow and his family in this their day of very sad bereavement.

HON. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, may I join the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Isley) and for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) in their expression of sympathy. I remember well when Mr. Homuth first came to this House in 1919. He was always a bonnie fighter, fighting for what he thought was right. He sat where the hon.member for Kingston (Mr. Stewart) sits today, and he enlivened this House on many occasion

by his lively exchange, his quick wit and his solid and sincere thinking. He also sat where the hon, member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) sits, and like some of the others, he finally saw the light. How I wish there were more who would see the light.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. KENNEDY: He fought three elections as a Conservative candidate and won them. I always admired his fighting ability, and the fact that he said what he thought was right. There was no camouflage about it all. I admire a man who hits me right in the face for what he thinks is right.

I want to join with the others in extending sincere sympathy to his widow and his daughter who, incidentally, live in my riding, and who voted right. She is a bonnie girl, and I do want to express sincere sympathy to Mrs. Homuth and her family.

MR. FROST: I might add a word to what was said by the hon. members for Waterloo County (Mr. Isley and Mr. Brown) - his native County, - and what was said by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy)..I am sure we all regret his passing. Many of us have lost a great personal friend. I have hunted on several occasions with Mr. Homuth, the last time being last Fall, despite his dissability. There are not very many people of whom this came be said. Mr. Homuth suffered from cancer of the throat and was operated on and apparently was completely cured, but he lost the use of his voice. Think of the courage of this man, who at one time was a very great orator and speaker, losing his voice, but still had

the courage to run in an election and win it. He had certain aids in getting around;,in election time he carried a micraphone to assist him. Mr. Speaker, it takes a man of great courage to do a thing of that sort and, despite his serious illness he was the life of any party he attended.

I want to add my word of sympathy and admiration for a very great and unique character. He was a fine gentleman, and will be very greatly missed.

MR. SPEAKE : Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE A FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 21.

THE POWER COMMISSION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-first Order; Second Reading of Bill No. 117, "An Act to Amend the Power Commission Act", Mr. Challies.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 117.

Mr. Speaker, as I said on the introduction of this Bill, it includes a number of sections which are not all related. They deal with various aspects of Hydro administration. I do not think there is any change in policy or principle, and this might be dealt with more extradiciously and in more detail when in committee of the whole, if that is the pleasure of the House.

MR. DENNISON: Would the hon. Minister (Mr.Challies) be willing to send this to the new Hydro Committee, or the Committee set up by the government.

MR. F ROST: That Committee really was not set up for the purpose of considering such a Bill as this, but it was for the convenience of the hon. members forllooking into

the reports and working of Hydro and obtaining information which is not readily available by any other methods. The matters which have been referred to that Committee will come before it in the course of a few days, and that will clarify the objects of the Committee, when the hon. members have the opportunity of discussing with the Hydro officials certain matters relating to the workings of the Commission in the course of its business.

I think this Bill may be given such consideration on second reading as the hon. members may desire and then let it pass to the Committee of the whole House for further consideration.

Motion agreed to: Second Reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE A FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 22.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF POWER ON NIAGARA RIVER

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-second Order; Second Reading of Bill No. 118, "An Act to Facilitate the Development of Power on the Niagara River", Mr. Challies.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 118.

In reference to the Bill, I remind the House that I said I would give the hon. members some of the physical features in more detail of the Niagara development. This was prompted by a suggestion from the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) who said a number had asked him questions about it, and I thought it would be a good idea to explain the physical features of the development, and for that reason, I have prepared some notes on a few of the salient features of it.

Heralding construction of one of the major projects of its kind in Canada, preliminary work is now underway at Hydro's new 600,000 horsepower Sir Adam Beck-Niagara Generating Station No.2. The new development, which will cost approximately $157,000,000, at present-day prices of materials and labour, will be located in close proximity to the present Sir Adam Beck station (formerly known as the Queenston plant).

The development would involve the construction of a generating station with six units of 100,000 horsepower each, a tunnell approximately 5-½ miles long and an open-cut canal about 2½ miles in length.

The new project would help materially to meet the steady increasing demands for electrical energy in Southern Ontario and that every effort would be made to have the development in operation by 1954, depending on the availability of adequate supplies of materials and labour.

Work is already proceeding on the storage yards, the railway facilities and the temporary living quarters for men on construction. At present there are approximately some 1,000 men on the job.

Meanwhile, orders have been placed for six, 105,000 horsepower turbines with governors with the Dominion Engineering Company and three of the six, 80,000 kv-a (102,500 electrical hp) generators with the Canadian Westinghouse Company in Hamilton and three with the Canadian General Electric Company. It is expected tenders for the construction of the tunnel will be called at an early date.

Contracts have been placed for the construction of the main office building and tenders have been received for two of the staff houses. An interesting feature of the staff houses, is that they are to be so constructed that they can be readily converted into apartments after all construction work on the new power project has been completed.

Tenders also would be called for the construction of a 30 bed hospital to be erected near the work camps. It would be built with sufficient room to accommodate extra beds if needed and that it was being planned to meet the needs of the Commission's employees in the camps and in order not to tax existing hospital facilities in the Niagara area.

The intake for the new project will be situated just above the Horseshoe Falls, or above the present submerged wier between Chippawa and Hydro's Ontario Power Plant intake. The waterway will be close to the river and about five miles shorter than the present open canal from Chippawa to Queeston. There will be about 5½ miles of pressure tunnel, and near the whirlpool, the tunnel will come to the surface and an open-cut canal will carry the water a further 2½ miles to the forebay of the generating station.

The routing of the tunnel has been planned so that construction operations will occasion the minimum of inconvenience to the public. It will be about 45 feet in diameter and will be lined with concrete. A major portion of the tunnel will be constructed in the H.E.P.C. transmission line right-of-way or other lands owned by the Commission. The operating head at the plant will be

about 292 feet - with a water flowage of 20,000 c.f.s.- each cubic foot of water delivering 30 H.P. or a total of 600,000 H.P. When one considers that the older plants at the Falls only deliver with each cubic foot of water -

Toronto Power Co.	approximately	9 H.P.
Can. Niagara Co.	"	10 H.P.
Ontario Power Co.	"	17 H.P.

how important it is to use the available water at the highest head as in the Sir Adam Beck Generating Plants 1 and 2.

The Hydro camps will be furnished with complete fire protection, sanitary services and hospital facilities. Provision, as required, also will be made for recreational facilities.

To help speed the building of the power-house, Hydro will construct an access road from the top of the bank near the Niagara Glen down the face of the gorge to the site of the new project at river level. The building of this road will be a most interesting engineering feat of considerable magnitude and will help to speed the free flow of materials and supplies required in constructing the generating station.

Later, when the big Hydro project has been completed, this road would be made available to the Niagara Parks Commission to be used as a scenic drive to enable tourists to obtain a close-up view of the turbulent lower Niagara River rapids.

All plans for the new power development are now in the advanced states. After all the necessary camp facilities have been established, the Commission will be in a position to build up the necessary construction force which will be one of the largest ever engaged on any Ontario Hydro project.

MR.W. T. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, one in opposition is hardly expected to be complimentary at all times, but I do want to say a word about this project which happens to be in my riding, and at the same time, compliment the Hydro Commission on the splendid effort they have made in the last year or two in bringing this project forward. It not only means a great deal to the Province of Ontario with regard to the power situation, but it means a great deal to the Niagara area.

When I was Mayor of Niagara Falls last Fall, I greatly appreciated when the project was first instigated, the Hydro Commission being kind enough to come down and consult not only with the officials of Niagara Falls, but those in Chippawa and Stamford and at that time, we formed a Committee to work with the Hydro Commission in an endeavor to solve the problems with which we felt we might be faced. The hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) came down and attended one of the conferences, and assured the City of Niagara Falls, the Township of Stamford and the Village of Chippawa that none of those municipalities would suffer.

We were somewhat concerned with the problem in regard to our hospital and our streets, but the Hydro was kind enough to see to it we will be afforded

some relief in that respect.

We were also concerned with the problem of policing, with six thousand or seven thousand workers, - whom we welcomed - and we were greatly relieved to be allowed to put on extra policemen to take care of that problem.

We feel that this project will be a tourist attraction, as was eveidenced yesterday - it being a nice day -- when we had some thousands of tourists down there, most of them to see the start of this project. May I say to the hon. members of the House that, not right away, but in the near future, they should motor down there and see the project in its initial stages.

With regard to its development right now; the Vice-Chairman of Hydro (Mr. Challies) has very well said it is in the embroyonic stage.

On behalf of the City of Niagara Falls, may I say that we appreciate the Hydro looking into the future with respect of the homes to be erected, that they will not be simply shacks or the providing of a stopping off place but will be permanent homes which can be turned over to the municipality upon completion of the project.

Then there is a further aspect from the other side of the river where Representative Mellor, of the New York State Legislature, is trying to put a bill through to get control of Hydro for private enterprise, but I can state very definitely that this will not be a private but a public enterprise. I doubt very much if that bill will pass. This is one of the things - and the most important thing which has been accomplished internationally for both countries in many years.

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, and to leave this thought not only with the hon. Vice-Chairman (Mr. Challies) of the Hydro Commission but with the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) as well, that lately -- and I agree with it -- they seem to be naming Hydro plants after various men who have been connected with Hydro.

We have the Sir Adam Beck plant now going, down at Queenston.

We have the Richard Hearn Steam Plant, I believe it is, which is indeed very commendable.

I think you have one plant in London, if memory serves me correctly, named the Buchanan Plant or something like that.

So I would ask the hon. Vice-Chairman (Mr. Challies) of the Hydro, when they are naming another plant, to see to it that it is named the Doctor Hogg Plant.

Doctor Hogg has been one of our outstanding Hydro engineers over the course of the last fifty years. Doctor Hogg really built Hydro, he knows every brick that has been placed into it, and I think it would be a wonderful tribute to pay to a wonderful engineer if the Hydro Commission would name one of their future plants, in the very near future, the Doctor Hogg plant.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. GEORGE H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Mr.Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity of expressing the appreciation of the Commission to the attitude of the former Mayor of Niagara as well as its present Mayor, and of the adjoining municipalities. It is only an example of what can be done when these bodies get together and with the goodwill of the people of the community can plan for the future. I shall remember the hon. member's (Mr. Houck) representations and if he will add to that of Doctor Hogg, the glorious and illustrious name of Doctor Gaby, I shall be very glad to join with him.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HOUCK: I will be very happy, Mr.Speaker, to "saw off" on that.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): May I ask, Mr. Speaker, does this mean the scrapping of two existing plants, or three?

MR. CHALLIES: Well, there is sufficient water to run them. When the third plant is built--may be built--then there will have to be a scrapping of existing plants, but as it is now there is sufficient water under the present change of arrangement, which is a very excellent one, whereby only a stated amount of water need go over the Falls at a certain time and the rest is available for power development, which means that at peak load times these plants can be used.

MR. HOUCK: May I ask the hon. Vice-Chairman (Mr. Challies), if they do scrap one of the plants, the man in the employ of that plant will be taken up in the other part of the system?

MR. CHALLIES: Oh, by all means.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): 23rd Order.

THE GAME AND FISHERIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 23rd Order, second reading Bill No. 130, "An Act to amend the Game and Fisheries Act." Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

Hon. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 130, "An Act to amend the Game and Fisheries Act."

I do not know that hon. members need any further explanation than I gave on first reading of this Bill. The main principle involved is doing away with the so-called "buck law." The rest of the amendments are mainly tidying up features which are quite evident.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I would just draw the hon. Minister's (Mr. Scott) attention to the fact that the late Jack Miner, who in many respects was one of our greatest workers in this province, one of the greatest naturalists in this province and one of the people most interested in seeing deer multiply in Ontario, took just the opposite position. He took the position that we should have a buck law and that some other arrangement should be made where in circumstances under which a doe or a fawn is killed inadvertently by a hunter, an extra penalty on top of their license might be applied.

And talking to Jack Miner some years ago about this, he claimed that in the State of Pennsylvania, where they had a buck law for many years, that the deer population had increased to such an extent that they were shooting more deer in Pennsylvania than we were in Ontario and, although they did not have the wolf problem to contend with, he maintained it was the buck law that resulted in that greatly increased deer population in that state.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

MR. FROST: 24th Order.

THE PUBLIC LANDS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 24th Order, second reading Bill No. 131, "An Act to amend the Public Lands Act." Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

Hon. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 131, "An Act to amend the Public Lands Act."

In the copy of the Bill, on page 2, in subsection 2 of 57 (a), there is a slight typographical error where it says: "----the land is not under timber license, the Minister upon application to the owner-----"; it should be: "-----upon application of the owner" there. That will be corrected in the reprints.

I think that hon. members are fairly familiar with the purpose of this Bill as explained on first reading.

Motiin agreed to.

MR. FROST: Order No. 18.

THE HIGH SCHOOLS ACTS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 18th Order, second reading Bill No. 100, "An Act to amend the High School Act." Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 100, "An Act to amend the High Schools Act."

I wish to draw attention to section 3 of this Bill, which was designed to deal with some situations that have arisen in different parts of the province where two or more adjoining counties have set up a high school district. The difficulty that was in mind in introducing this section was to facilitate the detachment from that district of some portion of the district, without the necessity of having both county councils pass upon it.

Now, this has caused a considerable amount of concern, because no matter which way we move in a situation of this kind, it is bound to disappoint some people. However, we have come to the conclusion that if this section is to stand, it would have very far-reaching effects in certain places, and we do feel that where municipalities have agreed to enter into a high school district and where two county councils are i volved, where the area covers portions of two separate counties, that the only reasonable thing, taking everything into consideration, to do in case any part wishes to be detached, is to have the approval of both those county councils, because they both have a stake in it and they are both interested in it.

That becomes very clear when you visualize a district that has been set up, boundaries have been fixed, the required amount of assessment is available for proceeding with the high school, and then when some portion on the fringe of that district for some reason or other wishes to change its mind, sometimes perhaps two, three or more years later, it might leave the majority of people in that disttrict very much worse off. Their assessment is reduced and they find that other portions may then feel that they want to break up, and the difficulty is, what is to happen then to the remainder, the bulk of thatdistrict. Now, of course if both county councils agree, then, , the detachment can be made under the present Act. It is now proposed in view of the difficulties which have been considered and reconsidered many times, we now think that this section could be dropped from the Bill, and I shall move in committee that section 3 be struck out, otherwise the Bill to stand the way it is.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

MR. FROST: Order no. 19.

THE OLEOMARGARINE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 19th Order, second reading, Bill number 114, "An Act to amend the Oleomargarine Act." Mr. Kennedy.

Hon. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 114; in moving second reading this Bill, Mr. Speaker, I might point out the need for this Act. When the Oleomargarine Act was put through two years ago, in a definition of "oleomargarine" it was stated that everyt ing but butter was to be considered oleomargarine, so that if the farmers put out a dair spread or anything, it would have to be called oleomargarine. The dairy farmers of Canada this year are trying to have a spread made out of milk solids, and, so as to have that sold as "ubberine" or milk or dairy spread or what not, the Act will have to be changed so it will not have to be sold as oleomargarine. Oleomargarine is that substance made of oils or fats only, and that is the first section of the Act. The first reason for the amendment.

The second is, some of the advertising I think is misleading and this will give us power to regulate the advertising of margarine and to see t at in no case should it be taken to represent butter but that it should be sold purely as margarine.

The next point has to do with the Order-in-Council goverining what margarine is. We are in peculiar shoes as regards margarine. Butter comes under the Dominion Government, and there is one composition of butter made by the Dominion Government. It is judged on its quality and inspected by the Dominion Government. Cheese is inspected by the Dominion

Government representing all of Canada. We have now five Acts in Canada governing margarine of different types. At a meeting of the Provincial Ministers last September, we decided to have one Act which would represent all Canada. I hope at the meeting this year we will be able to do it.

This is the reason for the placing of this Bill upon the Statute Books.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): Does my hon. friend (Mr. Kennedy) feel that the advertising by radio is covered in the Bill?

MR. KENNEDY: I beg your pardon?

MR. OLIVER: Advertising over the air, by radio; do you think that is covered? In two, for instance?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes, incorrect advertising.

MR. OLIVER: Pardon?

MR. KENNEYD: Incorrect advertising is covered. Anything that makes it out as a dairy spread.

MR. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) further, is it your intention to have this go to the Agricultural Committee?

MR. KENNEDY: Oh, yes.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) what has happened to that portion of the original oleomargarine Bill which was adopted here two years ago and which provided for signs to be posted up in every restaurant that serves margarine. As far as I can see, no signs were posted anywhere. I have occasion to visit public eating places from time to time, and while these establishments which I frequent are usually of a plebian character, they are I imagine the kind t at most hon. members, except the blessed few, frequent, and I

have yet to come across a restaurant that displayed any indication or any sign t at they are serving margarine. And I am sure th.y were serving margarine, and yet the law specifically sta ted--

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): How can you tell?

(Take C follows)

MR. SALSBERG: Well, I perhaps could not tell but I am sure the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) could not tell, he could not tell a lot of other things I asked him.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: Such as translating for me certain latin phrases. I had to go to the very good people in his department, who certainly translated it to me very quickly. However, the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) -- I am now addressing myself to the other half of the hon. Minister -- the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) undoubtedly has ways of finding out whether or not margarine is served instead of butter, therefore, this question can be broadened in view of the interest displayed by the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter). What has his department done during the last two years to enforce that section of the Act which this House approved of?

MR. KENNEDY: We found it very difficult to enforce the Act, we used our Creamery inspectors and in some cases people said they were using margarine and they had a warning not to use it again and as far as we know, they are not. Under the Act, the inspectors can go in and find out if there is margarine in the restaurant and if it is these regulations will be enforced. For the first time, with this Act, we have power to go in and search the premises.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have an announcement which I know will be of interest to the hon. members of the House in view of the discussion we had here on Friday in connection with the matter of milk and the obvious public interest there is in that subject.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) the other day mentioned that the board would be re-constituted so that there would be four members, the Judge really having a double vote in the matter and with producer, distributor and consumer representation. Now, the matter of getting a representative from the consumer standpoint is quite difficult as can be seen. From the producer standpoint it is quite easy to get the farmer groups to choose a representative and that also obtains with the distributors but to get a consumer representative of enough of the people, with the breadth of view, that is a very difficult assignment. There are very many interests indeed involved in this. It is quite easy here in this chamber or in someone's office perhaps, to brush aside certain considerations in this matter but, you take such matters as distribution points for milk where people might go -- the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) raised that point on Friday and I think the hon. member for St.David (Mr.Dennison)-- where people can go and carry milk. That sounds very simple but it is an immensely complicated problem as can be readily seen. Take for instance a small storekeeper, the small storekeeper can not afford to stock too much milk, he cannot afford to have milk left on his shelves. Therefore, if you have such a place as that you have to have the proper type of refrigeration and so on that would take care of large quantities of milk which, if it is not used, can be turned into something else or used for some other purpose. This matter is just full of things of that sort. It is quite easy to say, "why not have a five day delivery?", it sounds simple but then again the

question of refrigeration that our people have arises, have they got enough refrigeration in their homes to take care of a supply for two or three days? All that a housewife has to do is lose a bottle of milk and you lose a lot of one cent increases if you lose that bottle of milk. Therefore, the matter of getting a consumer representative has been a difficult one and when you get someone that is suitable then, in these busy days, you have to get that person who is prepared to give the time to the job. It is very easy to name people who are acceptable but, go out and try to get the people who would be acceptable in the ordinary case and ask them to be appointed and they are too busy. If they have all the requirements they are people difficult to get. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) and myself thought this over and put it up to the Mayor of Toronto, Mr. McCallum, representative of some 670,000 people in this community, a man, I think, that has the qualifications. The only thing he has not got is, obviously like everybody else, the time to do it. After discussing it with the hon. Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. Kennedy) and myself, to act as the consumer representative.

This acute problem involves the area within ten miles of where we are at the present time. Of course, it is a problem all over the province but a very acute part of this problem is within ten miles of where we are sitting here, and it is desirable to have someone who knows all the intricacies of the Toronto situation to act as a consumer representative. And then again, Mr. McCallum has behind him, which is very important at the present time, he has behind him auditors and people of that sort who have been

closely related to this problem because of the stand taken by the Toronto city council.

I might say, Mr. Speaker,we did not approach Mr. McCallum from the standpoint of his being the Mayor of Toronto, we approached him from the standpoint of being a representative citizen knowing about the needs of the people and being clsoe to the people. I think that is a desirable thing. We, of course, might go to some other community, there are other names that we considered farther from here but, nevertheless, at the present time it would appear for the next period of time, probably two or three months, this great area of Toronto and the surrounding municipalities are going to be the centre of the major portion of this problem. If this problem can be solved here then I think it will be automatically solved elsewhere. I think the great problem is to meet this situation here which we discussed on Friday, meet this situation here with cool common sense and I am quite satisfied, Mr. Speaker, in saying this to the House, I feel quite satisfied that the various interests in this problem, whether they be the producers, the distributors, labour, the public, the consumer, I think that all are prepared to approach this problem in a spirit of common sense and keep their feet on the ground. I am satisfied that willabe the case. Here is our position now, we are ready as soon as the Act is approved to go into business. I spoke this morning with the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy), we had a long chat with Judge Currie who has had a great deal to do with this Act over a period of years. We had a discussion with him, the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr.

Goodfellow) had a discussion with other interested parties this morning, and I am quite satisfied that we will get from these people the cool judgment that our people are prepared to give in all walks of life and we will arive at a solution that will make the people feel that everybody has a say, everybody is represented and the decisions are decisions which are wisely taken. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr.Kennedy) who had a lot to do with this would care to say something.

Hon. T.L.KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, all I can say is to repeat what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) said. It is not easy to get a consumer representative and I felt great happiness when the Mayor of Toronto consented to act, even if it is to get this Board started. I was very much impressed with this, I have been talking to all groups, I have talked to producers, labour, distributors and consumers and I was very much impressed with the fairness of every group, not seeing eye to eye, though, but everybody wanted to be fair. I am quite sure if we approach this problem with that same attitude of fairness we will come to some solution, it may not please everybody but it will be the best solution possible.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I do not know how we got into this discussion but once into it I want to make a remark or two. I think we are all conversant with the qualifications of the Mayor of Toronto but I think there are some disqualifications, so to speak, that one could mention.

MR. FROST: That is the case with everybody.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. McCallum was just elected Mayor of Toronto in a narrow squeak the last time, he is not going to run again and while he is mayor I do not understand how he is going to have time to give the proper thought to being the consumer representative on the Milk Control Board, what with his amalgamations and one thing and another he is going to be a busy man and I would say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) I am not enthused over his suggested appointment. I think you could have done much better if you had appointed a woman, a housewife in the city of Toronto.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: As the consumer representative on the Milk Control Board and failing that, he could have appointed a representative from the Trade Unions movement in the Province of Ontario, either one of those appointments would, in my judgment, have been superior in all points of view to the one the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has just suggested.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Page 39, Department of Education.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Chairman, with your permission and that of the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter)

if I might say a few words on a previous vote, I happened to be out of the House due to the uncivilized time that the debate was conducted to. It has to do with the office of Athletics Commissioner. A few days ago there appeared in the paper, on the front page of the Globe and Mail, a picture that had to do with a Donnybrook or a "hey Rube", free-for-all that took place at Maple Leaf Gardens. Now, I had a number of phone calls, Mr. Chairman, concerning that particular picture.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): What vote is that?

MR. THORNBERRY: Vote 42, item 44. I had a number of phone calls due to the fact that the recreational Director of Hamilton, Mr. Andrew Ley saw fit to make a comment on it, I think it might be brought to the attention of the hon. members of the House and of the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter). I would like to quote what Mr. Ley said at St. Catharines, he was speaking before a conference of the Ontario Recreation Association, he referred to a free-for-all fight and the suspension of Gus Mortson for hitting another player over the head with a stick:

> "Any decent Canadian who read the papers this morning would be ashamed to be a Canadian," Mr. Ley said. "If this is the best we can turn out in our national sport we should go in the nearest corner and die."
>
> Any person involved in a fight on the streets or hitting another person over the head on the street would be arrested, said Mr. Ley. Just because these incidents happened "under the guise of sports and recreation,

they get away with it."

Television wrestlers and roller skaters are teaching our children "dirty tactics", the Hamilton recreation director maintained."

Now, that tells the story, Mr. Chairman, to some extent and in view of that, I thought perhaps some greater authority might be given to Mr. Steel, the Athletic Commissioner, that he could deal effectively with that sort of thing. I believe we in this country have inherited the great tradition of sport from the old country and British sportsmanship and fair play is world famous and over there it is more important to play the game rather than win it but here we seem to have lost that point of view and are more intent on sports for the dollar and cents value rather than for the sportsmanship value. I am making that suggestion to the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) that although it may be a dangerous precedent to give more authority to the Athletic Commissioner, it may give some purpose in clearing it up.

This afternoon's paper has another picture similar to that and that is not so much in itself, it does not mean too much but it is the effect it has on the younger people coming along, if you combine that with the trashy literature that we are reading the next generation will be a breed of morons and sadistic gangsters. I see in Saturday morning's paper where the OHA hockey associati on has asked to reduce rough p' ying. I am sorry I was not in the Housewhen that item was passed but perh:"s the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) would take a minute to deal with that, if there is any possibility of the Athletic

Commissioner being given increased authority in view of that situation?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I think the point brought up by the hon. member (Mr. Thornberry) is of very great interest and I am aware of the problem. I do not know that I can go just as far as he did about the sadistic nature of the youth of this country today but then perhaps we keep different company. I do not know, but nevertheless the matter is a serious matter and I will be very pleased to consider the suggestion.

Votes 44 and 45 agreed to.

On Vote 46.

MR. JOLLIFFE: When is it expected that the new building will be ready for use?

MR. PORTER: I do not know that, I cannot say definitely, I think it should be ready anytime before the end of the summer. That is about as close an estimate as I can give. The construction of that building was carried on through the University of Toronto by arrangement, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr.Jolliffe) knows and we have not any direct representations but it looks as though it should be finished within the next few months.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The Archives are to go to the new building?

MR. PORTER: Oh, yes.

Votes 46, 47 and 48 agreed to.

On Vote 49.

MR. W. DENNISON (St.David): Mr. Chairman, on Vote 49 I would like to bring up a matter in connection

with the Ontario School for the Deaf at Belleville. I spoke to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) about this the other day and, in fact, we had a very nice little chat about it. We both agreed that, as we are laymen in this problem of the deaf, we had to pretty well be guided by what our officials said and yet, I am wondering in view of the great opposition that has been expressed by the Ontario Association for the Deaf and the Canadian Association for the Deaf, whether or not we are following the best practical methods of teaching at Belleville.

Now, just to review the problem, as I see it, the School at Belleville is not a teaching institution for people who have any hearing at all, it is a teaching institution for the stone deaf, the person who is unable to hear a sound. In the city of Torontoand other cities across the province we have so-called deaf classes but those are classes for the partially deaf, the people who can hear sounds by the aid of a booster device which increases the vibrations of the ear or just behind the ear.

(TAKE "D" FOLLOWS)

Now, the Association for the Deaf inform me that, after graduating from Belleville, 90 to 95% of the people who have been taught to get impressions of words from lip reading are unable to use it and have to go back to finger spelling or the sign language and the argument is, is there no way we can decide in advance who are capable to becoming good lip readers and who are not to save this extra money spent for training these people for something they find it impossible to use.

Looking at this from the standpoint of members of the Legislature, if we had an engineer come to us and tell us that the course of training at the University, when finished, had to be scrapped and did not fit them for their profession and they had to learn all over again after gradutaion, something would be done about it. If we had other professions telling us that, after they finished their training, they could not use it and had to learn something different after they graduated, we would have to take stock, would we not? We would have to ask ourselves: "Is there anything in this criticism of the methods employed?"

Now, the Ontario Association for the Deaf sent every hon. member of the Legislature,at the time they appeared before the Hope Commission, a review of their presentation to that committee under the heading of "Tyranny of Ignorance" and the thesis of this pamphlet is that our training is emphasizing lip reading when lip reading is far from an exact science; when very few people are ever able to use it and those who can use

lip reading are at best only able to get perhaps two words out of three and sometimes only one word out of three.

If you were listening to me at the present time and only heard every second word --

MR. PORTER: That would be a great thing.

MR. CHALLIES: That would really be fine.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: I know the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is not serious about that. I know he enjoys listening to me. But, to return to the argument - if you could only hear every second word I said, you would have a great many blanks in your minds as to what I was talking about.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: I know the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) does not understand me all the time. At the same time, I do not admit that is my fault. It is true that we, as hearing people, are prone, I think, to just naturally favour lip reading if at all possible because, under this theory of lip reading and speech training, it would be possible for a deaf person to mix with normal people as the normal people would like them to do. So the tendency, as normal people, would be to oppose the suggestion of the Ontario and Canadian Association for the Deaf. I wonder if we are not doing them a great injustice and have done them a great injustice over the years when we try to foist a system of training, with which they do not agree, on them. Mr. Peikoff of the Association and I were talking about this

the other day and I would like to review some of the statements he made to me. He said these theories, first of all, have been rejected by the Association. He says they may sound like something new, yet they have been tried over and over again and, in some instances in the United States, they have been abandoned and they have gone back to the sign language and finger spelling.

He said there is no real evidence from a practical standpoint to justify what he calls the "faddists" who insist on this principle of teaching being adopted and used in our provincial institutions.

He is of the opinion that the Ontario School for the Deaf at Belleville has had its standing in the province reduced in recent years because of the one-sided training.

The Association, for which he speaks, was organized in 1886 and I believe it is true to say that it represents the majority of the adult deaf who take an interest in this matter.

MR. SALSBERG: What is the name of it?

MR. DENNISON: The Ontario Association of the Deaf. The Association is quite agreeable to teaching the people who can hear a little, lip reading, because they can get the words but he is firmly of the opinion that otherwise, for the stone deaf, lip reading is not the answer. He says if something is not done soon, we will be in a position where we are training different people to talk one way and, when they leave school, they have to talk another and it disrupts the whole

conversational possibilities of the deaf and he is of the opinion that it just isn't practical for deaf people to communicate with normal people, except by writing.

Therefore, as a province, we should make it possible for deaf people to make their own decisions in this matter and not try to foist decisions, which may sound very nice to normal people, but not to the deaf people.

MR. SALSBERG: I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) might say a word or two on this question.

MR. PORTER: After you.

MR. SALSBERG: You expected me to rise?

Mr. Chairman, like most hon. members of this House, I am not competent to decide the argument which is now being carried on as to which system is better. But the hon. members of the House have received literature from various bodies concerned with this discussion and I would like to hear from the Department, through the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) what their opinion is, as to whether the present method is satisfactory and whether it is in line with what is taking place elsewhere and whether there is any need for a change.

I will finish in just a moment but I wish to say that, in a later vote, there is a provision for $15,200. for the deaf and hard of hearing. They must consider them an authoritative body or they would not subsidize them. Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) tell us what that organization does and what dispute --

MR. JOLLIFFE: They are right in the dispute.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, but since we subsidize them, we must recognize them and we should value their opinions because, if their opinions are not to be valued, we should not give them a contribution. If we do, what is their opinion and how will Ontario help them, putting it in laymen's language, so that inexperienced people in the province may understand what is obviously a serious matter to a great many citizens.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) wishes me to speak before him, may I say, Mr. Chairman, that it occurs to me if it has not already been done, the hon. Minister would be wise to get an independent appraisal in this matter from someone who is not connected in any way with the controversy which has arisen in Ontario and who has no connection whatever with the teaching of the deaf in Ontario. It should be possible to find such a person, perhaps in some other country --

MR. PORTER: I may be able to satisfy the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) on that point.

MR. JOLLIFFE: By all means and with that in mind, I will not pursue it any further.

MR. PORTER: After I explain it, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) wishes to say another word, that is all right. I will tell you exactly what we are doing along that line.

Mr. Chairman, the education of the deaf is probably one of the most difficult problems in education with which we are faced. I do not know whether the hon. members of this House realize that the pupils at the School for the Deaf are, for the most part, deaf in

the whole sense: they are born deaf; they have no hearing; they have never been able to hear; they do not know what sound means at all; the most they can do is to get some sense of rhythm through the beating of a drum or something which can be felt. As the result of that, they have a rhythm band at the institution and you see the deaf children playing some percussion instruments and will get some sensation which comes through their feet; they cannot hear anything but they get a certain amount of satisfaction from music through that peculiar and very limited device.

When you consider their disability, it is very difficult to compare disabilities. We can all visualize very readily the disability of blindness. We have a school for the blind which deals with blind children, most of whom have been blind from birth and not able to see. But they have one advantage which the deaf have not at all. They can hea r and one of their great outlets of recreation and satisfaction is music. They can get a great deal of pleasure out of music and they can hear one another talking and they can converse with one another and can live a very full life.

But a person who is born deaf is, in many respects, much more handicapped because he is taken out of the world, to a great extent. It is very difficult to establish some of those deaf people. Therefore, the problem of teaching the deaf is exceedingly difficult. On the other hand, you have the opinion of people suffering from that handicap and to the best of our ability we have to assess what its value is, as opposed to the

opinion of people who have been engaged for many years - in fact, many decades - in studying education, from the point of view of the deaf.

It is very difficult to educate the totally deaf and I think nobody as yet has found the final answer. We have to continue to try out different methods and we have to proceed in the hope that eventually we will be able to improve and broaden the method which will deal as fully as possible with this extremely difficult problem. When you have the views of people who are suffering from this disability, they are, for the most part, not educationalists in any sense at all. The most they can do is express their own recommendation, and their thoughts as to what might be better than what they have today - whether it would be better or not to have done away with the oral system and concentrate entirely on the manual system. I do not know how they can come to very many conclusions about that because that has not been done but, nevertheless, they have that view.

On the other hand, educationalists have generally taken the view that the oral method has this great advantage that, where a person can lip-read, he can find a place in society and be able to communicate with other people, perhaps to a limited extent but, nevertheless, can communicate with the masses of people with whom he comes in contact, whereas the person who has been trained in the manual method has not that advantage. These become segregated amongst themselves and the only ones with whom they can carry on a conversa-

tion are the people who use the manual system. So it would be desirable, if it were successful, to concentrate as much as possible upon turning out as many of these pupils in the School for the Deaf who can participate in a conversation with the outside world, even perhaps to a very limited extent.

We realize there are other views on this and they should not be overlooked and it may be we have not the final answer.

In dealing with this point, I would first say, in reference to the point raised by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg),that, when it comes to the grants for the hard of hearing, it is with the desire to assist the service organizations endeavouring to assist the deaf people in finding employment, very much as the Institute for the Blind does for the blind.

To date, 894 deaf persons have registered for assistance with the society. Of these, 533 are graduates of the Ontario School for the Deaf. An additional 6,508 hard-of-hearing persons have also registered for assistance with this organization.

Placement of graduates of the Ontario School for the Deaf is undertaken by the National Society of the Deaf and the Hard of Hearing. Seventy-eight graduates of the School, 48 other deaf and 61 hard-of-hearing were placed in occupations during the period February 1, 1950, to January 16, 1951.

The National Society of the Deaf and the Hard of Hearing receives a grant of $15,000. from the Provincial Government.

No information is available in the Department of Education as to the composition or membership of the Ontario Association of the Deaf.

That is the sort of work the National Society does and that is why we have allotted funds by way of grant for their purposes.

As to the Ontario Association for the Deaf, we have not very much information about the composition of the membership of that or whether or not they have ever sought a grant. I do not know that they would be entitled to a grant in the same way. I think they are doing a different type of work.

(TAKE "E" FOLLOWS)

Now, the report of the Advisory Committee on Education in Scotland in 1950 makes certain interesting comments about this subject, on pupils who are defective in hearing, and it states:

> "Throughout the long history of deaf education, there has been perpetual controversy regarding methods of instructions."

Developments in Ontario are no exception, We have had a controversy here, not only in recent years, but a prolonged controversy.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Excuse me, who is the author of this?

MR. PORTER: The quotation was from a report of the Advisory Committee on Education in Scotland, and I merely quoted one sentence. What I said about Ontario was not part of the quotation. "Throughout the long history of deaf education, there has been perpetual controversy regarding methods of instruction." That was the quotation. In Ontario, as I say, we have had similarly a prolonged controversy in the same way. To permit full consideration of divergent points of view in relation to the education of the deaf, the Department of Education appointed Mr. J. G. Demeza, formerly Superintendent of Public Schools in the Township of Teck, as Assistant Superintendent for the Ontario School for the Deaf, effective September 1st, 1950. He was requested to make a thorough study of the problems of educating deaf children. Mr. Demeza has undertaken this study. We consider him to be a highly qualified educationist in the broadest sense, with a fine record, well regarded in every possible respect.

Mr. Demeza has undertaken this study with no prejudices or preconceived theories regarding methods. He has been asked to acquaint himself with the methods of various schools and experts in the British Isles and in the United States and to report to the Department of Education upon his findings. At the present time he is attending the Department of Education for the Deaf at the University of Manchester. When he visits the United States, he will spend some time at the Gallaudet College, where manual methods are stressed.

I believe Mr. Peikoff, who is president of the Ontario Society and whom the hon. member (Mr.Dennison) mentioned, has inclined to the view that the Gallaudet College has the correct method. Well, Mr. Demeza, without any preconceived ideas, as an educationist, impartially, will visit that college and spend whatever time is necessary to assess what they are accomplishing and compare it with any other methods that he has been able to see.

As I understand it, the Ontario Association of the Deaf is critical of the Ontario School for the Deaf for these reasons:

1. Only the oral method based on speech training and lip reading is used in classroom teaching.
2. No instruction is given in signs or finger spelling.
3. No deaf teachers are employed.
4. Religious instruction is not imparted by manual teaching.

To answer these criticisms in part, the following points may be noted, and I do not say in all respects these

are final answers, but we hope that constructive changes may be made which will result from the investigation that is now under way:

1. The oral method aims to equip pupils for life in a hearing world. That is the theory. We know, as the hon. member (Mr.Dennison) has said, perhaps not too many of them really succeed in accomplishing that objective. That I think is open to some question. I am not so sure that any accurate figures are available at the moment. However, as I suggested to the hon. member (Mr.Dennison), I suggest that this school, as other schools, is open to hon. members of this Legislature to visit and I think it would be a very interesting thing to go through a school for the deaf, when you remember that the children come in there at a very early age, some of them as early as three, four or five years of age, and the instruction of children of that very early age to use their lips and speak when they cannot hear at all and have never been able to hear at all, is a very fascinating thing to watch, and those who are interested would gain much if they wished to go through there and see exactly how this is being carried on. I am sure that in spite of the criticisms -- co-operative criticisms -- there may be of the methods, the way that it is being carried on is most gratifying.

2. The children who learn speech acquire vocabulary and language constructions for use in thinking. It is an aid to the mental processes if a person can use his words in thinking.
3. Manual communication is simpler than speech and lip reading and, if permitted in the class room, would tend to exclude speech. The natural tendency would be for children to take the line of least resistance and to rely upon the easy method rather than the more difficult one and many who might gain great advantage out of lip reading might be denied that advantage if they were allowed to rely any more than necessary upon the manual method of communication.
4. The Ontario School for the Deaf does not ban signs or finger spelling outside of the classroom and its policy, therefore, may be regarded as a combined method.
5. Sunday school classes are held every Sunday morning for the imparting of religious instruction. Pupils also attend services in the churches of Belleville.
6. The policy of employing deaf teachers has declined in favor during the present century. According to our information no such teachers are employed in Great Britain, and they constitute only a small percentage of the instructors of the deaf and the hard of hearing in the United States. No deaf teachers have

been appointed to the staff of the Ontario School for the Deaf for several decades.

Mr. Peikoff makes that point, but on the other hand from the point of view of teaching and education, it does not always follow that a person who suffers from a certain disability is the best teacher of others who also suffer from the same disability. Sometimes the business of teaching can be better done by a person with an entirely different point of view and without the disability at all, and it may be that there would likely be a very small number of possible qualified teachers who might be people suffering from this disability.

However, those are the facts and I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) and I can assure this Committee that this Department is taking steps to consider any possible changes or adjustments in the methods that are being used, and that we are not approaching this subject with a closed mind, but we do not feel that we have the final answer necessarily, and we will be very quick and ready to make adjustments if we are convinced that they are along sound lines.

MR. E. B. MCLLIFEE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I am very glad indeed that the matter is being given considerable thought and that the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) has dealt with it in the manner he has. I do, however, repeat my suggestion that independent advice is quite essential.. I am not being critical of the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter), I just want to point out the peculiar position in which he or any other Minister has been placed by developments for which no doubt the present

hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is not responsible.

There are two organizations which claim to speak with some authority in this matter. Now, it is true that one is what the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) calls a service organization rather than an organization of the deaf and the other is essentailly an association of the deaf. However, I would point out to the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) that the National Society which we are told is a comparatively recent society, and which is engaged in placement work and so on and which no doubt frequently makes representations to the Department, the National Society unfortunately is charged by the other Association with having no deaf people on its Board. Now whether that is significat or not, it gives rise to friction and controversy, while on the other hand the Association of the Deaf headed by Mr. Peickoff does boast at least one educationalist. Its honorary president is, I believe, a retired teacher of the Belleville School for the Deaf.

I am not suggesting to the hon. Ministers (Mr. Porter) that all the criticisms or claims made by either organization are well founded, but I do suggest that the position is difficult also because the founder or leading personality in the Canadian Association for the Deaf is a former official of the Department of Education. Now, that may be perfectly proper, I am not saying it is something to be criticized, but that again is almost certain to give rise to the suspicion in some quarters that because the organization is led by a former official of the Department, that that particular organization's views get more consideration from the Department than the views of

the other organization, and the more so when the Ontario Association is, as the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) pointed out, essentailly an association of the deaf people themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I am not an authority on the subject, I am certainly not going to pretend that I know what the answer is, and I was glad to hear the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) say that the Department does not claim to have the final answer yet, but all I can say from any personal knowledge that a close relative of mine who is not deaf was very, very interested in this matter and did become both a lip-reader and a person very proficient in the manual method of communication, and the information she has given me is that the lip-reading method is an extremely difficult one to acquire and that in some cases it can be mastered only in a partial way except by people of abnormal capacity. That may not be correct, that is all I personally know about it, and as I say, I am not posing as an authority on either one side or the other but I do think that the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) and the Department badly need to be able to rely on some strictly independent advice. The appointment of an educationalist to study, I gather, all methods at schools abroad is, I think, a step in the right direction, subject to this, Mr. Chairman: It has not been made clear by the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) whether Mr. Demeze -- I believe that is his name -- whether he has a commission or an assignment to give the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) independent advice or the assignment to study methods abroad in order to equip him better to function at Belle-

ville under a policy which has been or will be determined by the Department. Now, I think there is rather an important distinction. Mr. Demeze after all is employed by the Department of Education, I suggest that he is employed in a rather junior capacity, he is not one of the senior officials of the Department, and I would not be too impressed of the value of that appointment or that assignment unless it is intended to listen to his advice from an independent point of view. If it cannot be expected to carry sufficient weight from a person of his status, then I think the government ought to get independent opinion from someone of other status abroad who has no background whatever that may be connected in any way with the controversies that have gone on here.

Now the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) may say there have been controversies everywhere and that you cannot get a neutral in this matter, but I do say an attempt should be made, because I think we are heading for a situation where we may find ourselves facing the hostility of a good many of the deaf people themselves, and that would be most unfortunate.

MR. PORTER: Well, I may say in view of what the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) has mentioned, that three years ago we did have an independent appraisal from Professor Ewing of the Manchester University, who approved of the methods that were being used in the school at that time. Now I must say in respect of that, it would have been possible for the Department, if they wished to pursue any rigid policy, to have rested upon that and simply taken no further steps to make any change or to close their eyes to

any possible suggestions that might come forward. But we did feel that in respect of Professor Ewing's independent apprisal -- and, after all, he had no connection whatsoever with the Department, he came from abroad; he knew what was going on in the Old Country, gut he was entirely new to the situation that he had to appraise here -- in spite of that apprisal, which was favorable of the methods in this School for the Deaf, we decided that still this was an open question and we should not just leave it at that, we should look further. Mr. Demeze has been instructed definitely to bring in a report which is not biased in any way by the past or the present policies of the School for the Deaf.

I can assure hon. members that the outlook of the Department is not a narrow, official outlook on these matters, they are genuinely seeking guidance and any new approach or any sound proposition or argument that will justify them in making any change which in the long run is going to be to the interest of the deaf people, I can assure hon. members there are no strings attached whatsoever to Mr. Demeze's mission, he is not there to get something that will confirm the correctness of what has been done. We do not want that, we want to know and we want to know everything there is to be known about this study because we realize there are many baffling aspects about it and that we may not have found the final explanation, we are very frank about that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Did I understand he is going to spend a year in the United States after his present --

MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. DENNISON: Did I understand the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to say that at Belleville there is no instruction in the manual system in the classroom?

MR. PORTER: In the classroom? No.

MR. DENNISON: Then we can hardly say factually that we are teaching both systems at Belleville. We are just teaching one system.

MR. PORTER: Well, the teaching is the oral method, and the National Scoeity favors a mixture of the methods. I think the Ontario Society favors the manual method. You have got those three grades of views. I say we are not finally decided in our minds that what is being done now is the very best thing and final policy that should be adopted, but it is a very difficult thing to come to some conclusion as to what really is the very best policy to adopt under these circumstances, But we hope to find out.

MR. DENNISON: It seems to me there is a great danger in what is happening at Belleville developing outside of the classroom a type of manual instruction which is of a poor grade or of a poor quality, and that danger would be present if you were to, say, in a public school system teach five or six or seven or eight subjects and then let those who wanted to learn geography do that after school hours among themselves. I am afraid you would have a group of graduates who did not know too much about geography although they might be able to use it for practical purposes.

I am wondering if there is not a real danger there in us in Ontario building up a situation where those

March 20th, 1914.

who are using the manual method are not using it as they should use it.

MR. W. E. DANDERCOCK (Hastings West): Mr. Chairman, I live very close to this school, it is in my riding, and I am sure we are very proud of this institution in the city of Belleville. I am sure the Province of Ontario might be very proud of it as well.

These children are bfought there very young and they are mothered there, they are looked after by ladies who are capable of taking care of them, and I would say that they are about the happiest group of young people that come down the street in Belleville.

This school has been running for a number of years and it has performed a wonderful service. A number of these children have stayed around the district and are good farmers, good workers, and I am sure I would like to see as many hon. members visit this school as possible. They would be surprised and delighted if they made a visit to this school and saw firsthand, the wonderful work that is being done there.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Mr. Chairman, I had three letters from various mothers of completely deaf children and they were unhappy about the progress their children were making. I do not know anything about the subject either, but it does seem that to become proficient in lip reading is very difficult and while the person who can become proficient in it may get along fine, there are not many of them who do so. At any rate, the children of these mothers were very unhappy about going back to school because they felt that they could

not get on with the method taught. I do not know the mothers, so I just give it to you for what it is worth, but those three families were troubled about the lack of progress of their children in lip reading.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) a question about the deaf children. What is done about the partially deaf, you know, the hard of hearing?

(TAKE "F" FOLLOWS)

MR. PORTER: Of course, there are auxiliary classes. Hard of hearing children do not go to the School for the Deaf. The School for the Deaf is entirely devoted to the entirely deaf, in the real sense, but, with partial deafness, if they are too deaf to get much good out of the ordinary school course there are auxiliary classes. Under the estimates there is provision for that, there is special teaching in many of the municipalities for that.

MISS MACPHAIL: Can you tell me anything about what method is used, is it some device to amplify sounds or is it a manual method or the lip-reading or what is the method used?

MR. PORTER: I am afraid off-hand I cannot answer that question, perhaps in a few moments.

Vote 49 agreed to.

On Vote 50.

MR. R. SCOTT (Beaches): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a couple of words on Vote 50 dealing with scholarships and bursaries ror universitystudents. I have referred to this in other years so I do not have to say too much this afternoon.

MR. SALSBERG: It can stand repetition.

MR. SCOTT; I notice there is a slight increase in the vote and I am very glad to see that. I wanted to bring to the attention of the House the extent to which we are failing to meet a very real need. These scholarships and bursaries are of a particular type, that is to say, they are designed for people on the basis of financial need. The "eligibility of applicants" form states that under no circumstances shall awards be made to students whose financial need is not clearly established even though they may be otherwise eligible so the important thing about these scholarships is that

they are based on the great financial need of the applicant. When you read through the various application forms that applicants fill in, you become quite convinced that the people who are considered for these bursaries and scholarships are people who really prove that there is not other financial assistance that they could receive, that they have not any money and do not expect to get any and that they are in very, very grave need of financial assistance to go to the University. When you look at the returns that have been totalled in previous years the thing that strikes me is that each year there are more and more and more people making applications for these scholarships and yet the number of them being agreed to is sitting just about the same or increasing only to a very small extent. For instance, in 1943 and 1944 there were 211 people who made applications for these bursaries and 101 were granted. As the years go by you find that more and more people apply and about the same number or twenty or thirty more are granted until you come to a year like 1950 when 578 people applied for the scholarships and 167 were granted. That is what the trend has been, that more and more people applied for them because of greater financial need and not many more scholarships are being given. It seems to me that we are failing to meet a very great need in view of the rising costs of living. It must be obvious when you are getting more and more applications from these needy people that there is a real job to be done in making some financial assistance available to these students. What I would like to know from the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is, first of all, what are you doing in negotiations with Ottawa to increase the number of these bursaries? What rpresentations have been made or what are you really prepared to do in the way of extending

a programme of this kind which is certainly very necessary and I think will become even more necessary in the years ahead?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I do not know that it is too small a programme to provide over 1,122 of these awards in 1950 and 1951.

MR. SCOTT: (Beaches): They are repetitious.

MR. PORTER: That does not matter, there are 1,122 awards given to assist students in higher institutions of learning. I do not think that is a small programme. As a matter of fact, that started from scratch a few years ago. After all, we are in this position at the present time, in the Universities of the province I believe the figure is 30,000 undergraduates today who apparently can find their way through by earning money in their spare time or working in the summer months or by assistance from their families or by these bursaries, there are nearly 30,000 undergraduates in the universities of Ontario.

MR. SCOTT: Not on bursaries.

MR. PORTER: No, I say there are 30,000 undergraduates in the universities in Ontario. I said there were 1,122 bursaries, if the hon. member (Mr. Scott) will listen. Now, that means that in the province of Ontario there are about four times as many young people going to university per capita of the population as there are in the British Isles, four times as many per capita. When you being to realize what the universities are doing, we are providing greater opportunities for university education in Ontario than they are in the old country which is regarded so highly for institutions of higher learning of all kinds. Then, we begin to see what

is happening in this country and there are many things to assist universities today to do their jobs. These bursaries are assistance to a certain group of people who might not otherwise be able to go to University. It is true, you can extend this and extend it without limit but, nevertheless, it is considered in view of what we have to appropriate for education in all its branches that this is reasonable at the present time. I would say that of the people who failed to get these bursaries, many are people who did not make the grade, many who are turned down are those who cannot make the academic grade. I am sure the hon. member (Mr. Scott) would not suggest we should subsidize them especially. There are some cases, there is not enough money to go around. They do not get these bursaries but I would say there are very few people in this country today who could not go to the University if they made up their mind to do it. People are doing that now and they have always done it. The universities are so heavily populated today it is a great problem to maintain the high standards we have known in our universities. The universities are doing a tremendous job under all the difficulties they experienced as a result of the war and the veterans they trained and took into their classrooms and in opening the doors to the mass of students in this province who desire and have the ambition to work their way through. They have even got the money and 30,000 are able to do it. It seems to me that speaks very well for itself.

MR. SCOTT (B eaches): Mr. Chairman, I was going to say that that is all very well to get up and give a round figure of 1023 or something like that --

MR. PORTER: 1,122.

MR. SCOTT:(Beaches): But a lot of those are repeats in the second year.

MR. PORTER: You do not quarrel about that? I agree with that.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): I am not quarfeling about that.

MR. PORTER: Why not, do you not like that?

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Yes, I am not objedting to it, I did not say I objected. I wish the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) would listen to what I am pointing out to him. What I am saying is that one of the best ways to test a programme of this kine is to consieer the number of scholarships that are given each year, the students who are entering the universidy, not to lump together second, third and fourth year and the outside classes and give us all that amount, but to guage the plan on the basis of how many students want to enter the university each year, people who enter each year. It seems to me that is where your plan is falling down. Nevertheless, in 1950 I already pointed out some 578 applied for scholarships to enter the first year of University and only 167 were granted. I have already indicated on the basis of the present costs that all of these people are in great need of financial help. In 1949, 495 applied and 158 were granted. You can go right back through the years and you rind the same thing, that the trend is as the cost of living goes higher and as the costs of attending universidy goes higher that more andmore students make applications for these scholarships because they need financial help and the number of scholarships being granted is rising at a very, very slow rate. You speak of the 30,000 people attending the universidy here in Ontario compared to Britain but in Britain, and these are rought estimates, about 60% are receiving government assistance and in Ontario about 8%.

MR. PORTER: Yes, but you have many more students here.

MR. SCOTT: Quite true, but it is still a percentage. Also, it is not always a fair thing to go and take your self and compare yourself to some other country. The true test should be, "are we doing the best we can on the basis of our financial policy today," not to take a rich Province like Ontario and compare it to some other country. I remember last year you compared it to Saskatchewan and some other provinces. The right thing to do is to take a look at Ontario and see what a wealthy province it is and see how many people want to go to University and then say, "are we doing as much as we should be doing on that basis?" and I say we are not. Again, I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) if he made any representations to Ottawa to alter this scheme, to enlarge it? Do you intend to make such representations or do you intend to allow the scheme to go on the way it has in the past?

MR. PORTER: We have made no recent representations on that scheme.

MR. SCOTT: Do you intend to in the future?

MR. PORTER: That is in the future.

MISS MACPHAILE: Mr. Chairman, inview of the scarcity of teachers do these bursaries or scholarships extend to students wishing to attend normal school?

MR. PORTER: Oh, yes. The normal school is qualified as one of the institutions to which these bursaries are granted.

MISS MACPHAIL: I know one student this year who asked about it, I am not sure whether it was the Department of Education or not but anyway the information given was that it would be $150. which is just peanuts. I mean, you could not eat let alone pay transportation, buy books etc., it was

not any good at all.

Vote 50 agreed to.

On Vote 51.

MR. J.G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, On Vote 51, I would like to direct two or three questions to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter). One would have been easily answered had the Estimates been placed in comparative form as they are in the federal budget but I would like to know how this figure compares, $46,100,000.00 with last year. I would also like to ask him if this figure includes the cost of school books for the students and whether these school books are available to the secondary schools as well as elementary schools and how much is included in that $46.million for school books? If he just keeps those questions in the back of his mind, there is another question that seems to be confusing in the amount of money school boards throughout the province who have committed themselves for capital expenditures. Many of them are under the impression that the amount of the annual subsidy in connection with the debentures which have been issued is guaranteed throughout the period of the debentures. I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) if that is correct or whether this is merely on an annual basis from year to year?

MR. MILLARD: If the hon. member (Mr. Brown) does not mind, perhaps some of the questions will overlap.

MR. PORTER: That will be more satisfactory, I think.

MR. MILLARD: In Vote 51, I would like the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to explain what has happened to Vote -- on item 3. Last year in our Estimates we found there, "night classes $330,000".

MR. PORTER: I think I can answer that.

MR. MILLARD: And auxilliary classes $20,000. both of them have disappeared and gone someplace else.

MR. PORTER: They have gone someplace else.

MR. MILLARD: I noticed the entire amount is for the Legislative grants is some nearly $5 million more, within $100,000. of being $5 million more and yet the entire vote of Vote 51 which includes all these special grants is also just $5 million more and some of these have materially increased. Even when you take the deduction off, the items you have mentioned, the total vote is just $5,075,000. more and yet the vote for general legislative grants if $5 million less $100,000 more and I would like the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) when he is making an explanation of this particular vote that is one of the largest, I believe that passes this House at any time, I would like him to deal with this question of the legislative grant system.

Now, I do not propose to try to explain as a layman the legislative grant system in the Commission on Education report but it certainly advocates a new system with some new factors to be considered.

Now, last year we were told the government introduced a grant system and we were told that it was an improvement and we would have to wait and see how it worked out. Well, the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) will recall that I have asked a couple of questions on the Order Paper respecting the amount of grants. Now, at page 18 of today's Order Paper there are two important questions dealing with this matter that have not yet been answered. These questions were:

> "What were the amounts of the general legislative grants paid in each of the years 1949 and 1950 for public schools in (a) Mimico,(b) East York Township!

Then, question 181:

> "With respect to the answer given to question No. 15 (Votes and Proceedings, February 23rd, 1951, page 150) what is the explanation in the increase in the general legislative grant paid i n 1950 as compared with 1949 in (a) Forest Hill Village, (b) Scarboro Township."

Now, to refresh the hon. Minister's (Mr. Porter) memory and the memory of the other hon. members as it appears on page 150 of the Votes and Proceedings was answered as follows:

> "In Toronto in 1949 under the grant system that prevailed in that year the total grant was $1,699,160.49 and in 1950 the comparable figure is $1,659,404.68".

A drop of some $40,000.

MR. PORTER: What was that?

MR.MILLARD: A drop of $40,000 between 1950 and 1949 for the city of Toronto. Now, in Forest Hill Village the two figures appear as follows: $43,411.16 in 1949 to $70,636.12 in 1950 or an increase of $27,224.96. Now, in the case of the whole city of Toronto there is a drop of approximately $40,000 and in the case of Forest Hill Village there is an increase of $27,000. roughly. Now, in Long Branch, which is a matter I have brought to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) on several occasions, previouslyin Long B ranch where they have a very fine high school and where their per capita grant, that is per pupil per capita is very much less than it is in Forest Hill Village,when you consider their assessments, in Long Branch for 1949 the grant was $33,320.81 and in 1950 it was only up to

$35,035.42. In other words, in that particular situation where they have a much larger public school population, they have an increase of only $1,714.61 as compared with Forest Hill Village of $27,224.96.

(TAKE "G" FOLLOWS)

as compared with Forest Hill Village, $27,224.96.

Now, Mr. Minister (Mr. Porter), it appears on the face of it that the present system of grants is not satisfactory because - and I think the outstanding classic example in Ontario will be Forest Hill Village and Long Branch - you seem to be taking away, to some extent, from those who have not and giving it to those who have because it certainly has increased the grant greatly as far as Forest Hill Village is concerned but only in a negligible amount as far as Long Branch is concerned.

I would like to know if the government has given any consideration to the question of revising the grant system, particularly in view of the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Education? That was one matter which the Commission specifically referred to and upon which they obviously spent a great deal of time. Since 1943 in this House - in the years I have been here - I have been raising this question os some kind of an equitable basis for the giving of grants and I notice,in the report of the Royal Commission, there is the question of equalized assessments throughout the province as a basis of finding out what the grants ought to be. I think that is one thing, particularly in regard to our cost of education, which is very necessary and is a sound recommendation and it should be done on the basis of equal assessment, as far as the local share is concerned.

Then I would like to know, with regard to this grant itself, whether or not any consideration was

given by the Department of Education or the government to the question of taking over, because of the problem of teachers' supply and teachers' training, the whole cost of the teaching staff and leaving other costs, such as building costs, and so on, primarily to the local authority, because this whole syst em of grants is climbing year by year - and I notice it is nearing $5,000,000. this year and I am taking in consideration the question by the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) as to how much is involved in that $5,000,000. by way of subsidies and the change-over in providing text books for pupils. Perhaps the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) would give us an explanation of the whole policy with regard to grants.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I would begin by saying this: if we had equalized assessments throughout the province, the problem of school grants would be very greatly simplified; there is no doubt about that but we have not reached that, we are still a long way from it, although progress has been made. We have had to work out as best we can certain bases for rural grants and for urban grants, which are a little different in the formula.

But the main principle underlying the grant system which was introduced a year ago - the first change that was made over the system we have had since 1945 - is that we introduced a per-pupil grant as a portion of the grant. In 1945, the scheme that was laid down was based on the actual expenditures, the cost of operating the school, including all the items involved

in that, in the year preceding the grant. That was considered to be as good a yardstick as we could get and that was done.

It was to be expected, of course, that some places would go ahead more extravagantly than others and there was some alarm shown as to possible rapid increases, as opposed to other places, in the costs which, in some cases, might not be entirely justifiable for the grant purposes at any rate. So, in the grant scheme of 1945, there was introduced a per-pupil ceiling beyond which the board was not eligible for a grant. That was maintained during the life of that formula.

One of the difficulties which was encountered arose from the very great expansion of school building which has occurred in the past five or six years. Those communities where the building was being done so rapidly and so intensively were those in which so many families were moving in and the number of pupils was growing up almost over night and the debenture burden for new buildings was becoming intolerable and, as a result of the grant system of 1945, they were very much cramped for funds in the years when they needed them because the ceiling was the same across the board, whether they were building or not. Many of them, of necessity, went beyond the per-pupil ceiling because of the building programme they were forced into because of the needs of an expanding number of pupils.

Also, there was the very great difficulty involved in reviewing the annual statements of school boards as to their cost of maintenance and operation and the

checking of all those items. This was a tremendous undertaking and, if that could be simplified, it would undoubtedly improve the whole system of grants.

One approach to this problem was to work out something of a per-pupil grant which would assist those areas which were growing rapidly and having a sudden influx of a great number of pupils.

After all, there is a great deal of justification for basing the brants on the number of pupils because it is the pupils who count in an educational system and in some schools they find they are unable to raise enough money and cannot increase their annual expenditures and,under the old system, they would not get as large a grant the next year, while the board which was able to go ahead on its own would get a higher grant next year. So we thought a per-pupil system should be introduced.

It was obvious, if you have a per-pupil grant across the board, it would be inequitable because the larger cities would be paid on exactly the same basis as the others, unless some other procedure were introduced. But we thought that the per-pupil basis, to some extent, would be a partial cure for some of the problems of expansion and would put the boards,in places where they had light expenditures in the previous year, in the same position as those which had a higher expenditure, in a more equitable position and might encourage some of the boards which were finding it difficult to expand. So there was a per-pupil grant introduced into the elementary and secondary schools.

In addition to that, it was decided that those boards which had to build new buildings should have some special consideration. They were the ones who were taking the brunt of the new expansion going on and they were being faced with all the costs of building, which were steadily mounting. So we decided that, in addition to the per-pupil grant, which was a flat $16. per pupil, we would add a percentage of the debenture payments which had to be made in the previous year. Those were payments which consisted of both principal and interest and the percentage was worked out, as you are now familiar, with the general system of working out these percentages.

This system is a little different in the rural areas from that used in the urban and it necessitated a complicated scheme, a scheme which endeavoured to meet the different conditions and the different financial needs of the different communities but we did the best we could without an equalized assessment. If we had an equalized assessment, it would probably fit better but, nevertheless, it does fit not too badly.

In addition to that, we added another item, the percentage of salaries of school teachers, which would put that item by itself in this respect, that where boards found they were able to increase the salaries of school teachers, they would get a grant on whatever increase it might be. It was more or less an encouragement to the boards which found themselves in a position to do that.

There was another item in the grant and that was where transportation was necessary in the large school

areas.

That is the general basis of the grants. The hon. member (Mr. Millard) has mentioned certain specific instances where there appears to be some differences which should be accounted for. The fact is that, im Long Branch - one of the places he mentioned - they have not undertaken any great building programme in the last year or so and, therefore, have not participated in the percentage of debenture payments because, apparently, they did not have to build. I do not know just what the population there is but it is my recollection that Long Branch is fairly well filled and there are not any subdivisions moving in, as they do elsewhere, including Forest Hill and Scarboro which is a community expanding rapidly, where new schools are being built every few months and they have great trouble in catching up with the need.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to say I did not put Scarboro in, for the reason I knew they had that condition down there.

MR. PORTER: I misunderstood the situation. I thought I got it from you but it may have been in my own mind and from my own thinking.

MR. MILLARD: It was in the question.

MR. PORTER: That is where I got it. Scarboro is obvious because it is a place where you would expect an increase as a result of the influx of pupils and the costs of the additional teaching staff.

Forest Hill Village would not appear to be quite

the same but they have had a great number of buildings there and there is a new high school there --

MR. MILLARD: And one in Long Branch, too.

MR. PORTER: Whether or not the first payment on that has come in, I cannot say. It is true that these figures, on the face of them, might require some explanation but it is by applying this general principle that these figures were arrived at and, when we look into them, we find that some building programme or increase in the debenture item or in teachers' salary item, enters into the picture. Forest Hill Village is noted for that. No doubt the increased pupil population has something to do with it.

I do not know what the situation in Forest Hill is but there must be a considerable increase from the building they have been doing.

And from all this, the substantial amount of money may not be as big an increase as might appear on the surface.

It may be that in some cases, there are still adjustments which might have to be worked out from time to time but, on the whole, looking over the problem with the conditions we have - unorganized territories and others - this system which provides, to some extent, for a per-pupil grant, these specific items on which we pay a percentage on a higher scale, does not appear too bad. It is a practical scheme of grants, one that is easily figured because the statement of the school board as to how much they pay for non-teaching employees is not so important; all we

have to know is how many pupils they have enrolled, what the teachers' salaries are, and the debenture payments, and it is a very simple thing to administer from an accounting point of view and it is a very equitable system compared with the old one and, I think, compares with any we have considered because we are considering all the proposals we can get as to how to best meet our objective and to iron out any difficulties there might be in this complicated basis of grants' scheme.

I think, therefore, the principal point in a grant scheme is to provide equalization with expedition and efficiency and, so far, we have been unable to find anything which would be very much of an improvement on this, without perhaps running into some other difficulties.

(TAKE "H" FOLLOWS)

You may contrive an improvement along one line, and then you try to apply it and see how it works out in the different types of municipalities we have all across the board, and you find it might be a great thing for a certain group and might be a very bad thing for another group. That is what we have to watch, and it is not an easy thing to do, and an equalised assessment would solve a good many of the remaining problems, there is no doubt about that.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr.Chairman--

MR. PORTER: Well--

MR. SALSBERG: I am sorry.

MR. PORTER: Well,once in a while let me have a say.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, you always get it.

MR. PORTER: The hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) mentioned something about the figures in item in vote 51. That $46,100,000 includes a provision for schod books which will amount to about $2,000,000. The provision for school books is limited to the elementary schools, grades 1 to 8; as to the secondary schools,there is still a provision in one of the Estimates for the subsidy that we have, similar to what we have been paying before-- we pay a subsidy to the publishers who make the school books. But the grant for school books is $2,000,000 and it appears here for the elementary schools.

The hon..member (Mr. Brown) also asked whether debenture payments were guaranteed. No, they are not guaranteed. I do not know whether it would be possible for the government to do that; it has been considered but people seem to be getting along pretty well as it is, and rather than reductions they have generally been getting morerather than less so far, and they have not been discouraged from proceeding with a vast building

program on the strength of the system of grants that h as been laid down and the present method of Borrowing money. That is the situation.

MR. F.R. OLIVER (Grey South): Well, does my hon. friend (Mr. Porter) not think there should be a minimum guarantee?

MR. PORTER: Well, I do not think there has been any real need for it. People have been quite ready to go ahead on this basis, they appear perfectly confident, And arter all, this is one of the conditions that applies in building a school. The obligation on that debenture is entirely municipal.

MR. OLIVER: I'll say it is.

MR. PORTER: We do not sign the debenture. We are not a party to the debenture,all we do is this, and this is all this government has ever done, and it has worked very well: We say to a certain municipality that wants to build a school. Well, build the school you need, but you must make sure that you can borrow sufficient money to build that school and they borrow that money on their own borrowing resources. Then we pay a percentage of the debenture payments.

MR. J.G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, is there not a promise, or a verbal promise, made to these boards when they make application?

MR. PORTER: None whatever. If there were see what would happen. In the urban municiaplities, the grant scale is determined by the population, in the elementary schools at any rate, and in the secondary on a somewhat different basis. Now, populations change, a municipality might acquire a lot of industry and expand and increase its population and go from one category into another, and the percentage it would get on its grant would go down one year from what it was the year

before. Now, it surely would not be fair, looking at the province broadly and taking into consideration the differences that there are , it surely would not be fair to say to a certain municipality: "We will pay you 40% for 20 years on your debenture payments," and in five years they might come into quite a different class of municipality, might have acquired a lot of industry and new population and they are a much wealthier municipality than they were when they incurred the debt, and yet we would be bound to pay the percentage that was fixed on the old population basis and on the old assessment basis.

Now, we say that if a municipality grows and expands and becomes wealthier, well according to the scheme of grants, the percentage goes down a little with each increase. Or vice versa, if a municipality finds it is contracting and it is losing population and has had to build a school, well it gets to the point where it gets a larger percentage. That works out very satisfactorily and very equitably. The only danger these municipalities and school boards might feel is if some day there is a change of government which might reverse this policy and might not pay these grants.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: No, no.

MR. H.C. NIXON (Brant): A change in government?

MR. OLIVER: No, a change in policy.

MR. PORTER: I do not know whether I have heard anything from hon. members about that. I am sure there will be no changes of any kind and by the time all these grants are paid off, in 20 years, we will still be here anyway, so apparently the people are satisfied to that extent.

I do not know whether I have answered all?

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York West): I just raised the question of the omission of those two large items.

MR. PORTER: Oh, yes, I overlooked that. That was in--

MR. MILLARD: 3 and 4.

MR. PORTER: Yes. Now the night school item is included in vote 51 (1). That is in the general grants, and it is shown there. The other was the auxiliary class item, was it not?

MR. MILLARD: Yes.

MR. PORTER: Item 2 in vote 51, auxiliary classes, $150,000. The auxiliary class grants to sanitoria for secondary school slasses formerly charged to item 3 has been included here for convenience and because the Boards of Sanitoria are established under The Public Schools Act. So it really regarded in a sense as the public school.

MR. MILLARD: Then they have gone back to the elementary schools?

MR. PORTER: Yes. Does that answer the question?

MR. MILLARD: Yes.

MR. J.B .SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, on the item of grants, I can appreciate the complicated problem that the government is confronted with in its distribution of those grants. It is quite obvious that certain communities require higher grants than others in order to establish a generally equal level of educational opportunity for the children of the province. From that point of view the system of percentages may be justified, but I suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) that, pursuing that policy as they do, they nevertheless should live up to the promise that the party in power made to the people in this province, as it was

understood by the people of this province and which in my opinion they did not live up to. When the Conservative Party went to the people, they promised that they would pay at least 50% of the cost of education, and people voted with that understanding, believing that half of their education bill would be cut and that their tax rate would be reduced proportionately.

This has not been the case in such areas as Toronto and, I am told by hon. members alongside of me nor in many other places. Now, certainly in Toronto a city that I know something of, the promise of the government has not been kept; the benefits that were to have accrued to the ratepayers were not attained, and the people of Toronto are right, when they are openly saying, that the government fell down on its promise that it did not keep its promise.

Having said that, I agree that certain communities are entitled and should receive higher grants. The government should adhere to a policy where at least 50% of the cost of education will be met and where a higher grant is necessary, then proceed to give it to them. In other words, in some of the rural areas where the grants go up to 60, 70 and in some cases even 80--

AN hon. MEMBER: 90.

MR. SALSBERG: Pardon me, I am told in some cases as high as 90, I do not quarrel with that type of grant, I think we should continue it but there should be a floor under the grants, That floor should be 50% of the cost of education, as was promised to the people by the government. And I think it is high time when we discuss these grants that the government should announce a change of its policy to the effect that the

the minimum of 50% will be paid. I am sure that the taxpayers in the riding of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) represents have expected a payment of at least 50%.

MR. PORTER: Never even mentioned it.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) says he never mentioned it in his constituency.

MR. PORTER: No, they never mentioned it to me. Nor did I ever mention it, never made any promise.

MR. SALSBERG: Then I suggest the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) descend a little from the upper sphere where he associates in his riding and go down to the working class section of his riding, and he will find that they ask that very, very persistently, because the working people who live in the lower part of the hon. Minister's (Mr.Porter) riding would certainly benefit greatly if the promises of the Conservative Party were kept. As far as the Party is concerned, they reneged on their promise, they did not do as they promised and the people expect them and want them to live up to that promise; that is that a minimum of 50% of the cost of education to be taken over by the province, and they do not regret nor do they resent the granding of higher percentages to areas that require such special consideration.

MR. PORTER: Well,Mr. Chairman, this point that the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) raises is becoming another old chestnut, in a sense. A lot of water has passed under the bridge.---

MR. SALSBERG: Well, old promises are remembered by people.

MR. PORTER: Let me point out a few aspects and if the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) approached this with an unbiased

mind, he can go out an correct some of the constituents he finds have been misled at some time.

In the first place, if you will just look at that promise--I have not brought a copy of ithere, even--

MR. SALSBERG: I am sure the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) has it and will be glad to read it.

MR. PORTER: The hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) has it no doubt. He keeps these things.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): I have it right here.

MR. PORTER: He has no doubt learned it word for word, which I have not, but if you go right back to the promise in 1943, it said something about 50% of the cost of education that time--- at that time. It was in relation to the conditions of the time when the promise was made. There was not any promise to pay 50% of the cost of education for all time no matter what that cost might become.

MR. SALSBERG: Wasn't there?

MR. PORTER: There was no promise to pay anything on buildings at all, on construction. There was nothing of that kind. It was a promise that was made in relation to the conditions of the time, in 1943, and the total cost of education in the province in that year of all the school boards was about $50,000,000. Well now, we are paying in grants of $46,000,000. If that is not 50% of the cost of education at the time the promise was made, I do not know what it is. It is more like 90%---that is just about what it is---it is more like 90%.

It is all very well for the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) to say that certain people had expected that their municipal taxes would go down as a result of those grants--and in some cases they did; as a result of these grants in some places

they did. But what happened was this, we were faced with increasing costs of everything. Every person that a municipality had to hire, everything a municipality had to buy, everything a school board had to buy, was going up in price. Wages were going up, salaries were going up, costs were going up for everybody in every line of endeavor.

MR. SALSBERG: How about your income here?

MR. PORTER: If you willjust let me answer your great point, you spent a long time making it, I am going to take a long time tearing it down, if I can.

MR. SALSBERG: Okay.

MR. PORTER: And I no doubt shall.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: If you consider the actual amount of taxes raised in municipalities for school purposes and take the mill rate, take it right in the city of Toronto, compare it with what it was in 1939; has that gone up anything like what prices and aalaries and wages have gone up in those intefvening years? Nothing like it. If it had not been for our grants it probably would have, it undoubtedly would have, but the grants have kept the actual raise in the mill rate for school purposes at a very much lower level than they would have been if it had not been for the grants that were made.

MR. G.E. PARK (Dovercourt): The reassessment was a factor in the mill rate.

MR. PORTER: That was a factor, yes,but that applies to other municipalities as well. Reassessment or no reassessment, take the whole thing, the amount you pay for your education tax, or that any person pays on an average sized house in the city of Toronto is just a little bit more perhaps than a telephone bill today. That is about what it amounts to.

Now, if people are not prepared topay that out of their pockets for taxes--they pay a lot more for many other things--if thatis not an unbearable burden of taxation, figure out what a telephone bill costs and if you have a bigger house and have two telephones, then you are probably paying about the equivalent of the two telephone bills, but that is your business. That is about what the cost of education is to the taxpayers in the city of T oronto today.

Now if that is too much, if that is a pressing burden which is grinding down the people in the City of Toronto, well I do not know, if it is an alternative to having a telephone in the house or having an education, I would think that right-minded people would prefer to do away with the telephone. That is what I would think, unless they needed it for business which in most residences they do not.

Education is costing more and more. $50,000,000 covered the whole bill throughout the province of Ontario in 1943. Today it is $100,000,000. I do not know that our grants come quite to the 50%, but they are pretty close to it. And right now, according to the costs we have today of everything they have gone up and more than gone up, away beyond what was contemplated in 1943 when that promise was made and it is entirely unrelated to the conditionsthat were in existence at the time that promise was made. And if any promise was ever carried out 100, 200 or 2000%, it was the promise in relation to the cost of education.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(TAKE I Follows)

MR. SLASBERG: Mr. Chairman, I must rise now to correct the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) who was trying to correct me and only to get himself in a little bit more involved. In the first place, was there such a primise made, and if there was, was it carried out? You will notice that the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) started out by questioning whether the promise was made and ended up by saying it was carried out 100 %. Now it cannot be both, was it made, and if it was, was it kept? We would be satisfied with 100%.

MR. FROST: If it was made, it was carried out.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) also stated that the total cost of education is rising, of course, and the party that won the election at that time on that promise, one of the promises, anyway --

MR. PORTER: And again.

MR. SALSBERG: Only promised to pay 50% of the then cost of education.

MR. PORTER: That is what we were talking about at that time, and we were told that we would ruin the country and even the hon. Leader of the Opposition was not quite so sure we should get into it --

MR. SALSBERG: Not only was the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) --

MR. JOLLIFFE: There was no opposition to it.

MR. PORTER: We will look it up in Hansard.

MR. SALSBERG: Not only was that not the case, I suggest there were no strings whatsoever attached to the promise to reduce the cost od education to the tax-payer by 50% but that the matter of 50% cost was dealt with in a separate point of the 22 points that dealt

with taxes and not education. The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) has forgotten his Port Hope program. He will recall such a program at one time that he was godfather to and perhaps a fine program, but he wants to forget Port Hope.

MR. PORTER: Get on with it.

MR. SALSBERG: I will forget Port Hope. Now, here is a quotation from the 22 points, it is number 9 and I shall read it again:

> "There will be a sweeping revision of our whole system of real estate taxation so that the owning and improvement of homes and farm land which are the very foundation of our society will not be discouraged by excessive taxation. As an initial step in that direction the Provincial Government will assume at least 50% of the school taxes now charged against real estate. It is, however, to be clearly understood that it is ---"

MR. PORTER: The words are right there, "charged against real estate", I thought that was there.

MR. SALSBERG: Wait until I finish the point.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Has he heard it?

MR. PORTER: No, no, no.

MR. SALSBERG: Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) let me finish reading one of his own points that answers it, just exactly what I thought.

MR. PORTER: That clearly explains that it is changed. You have gone so far beyond that it is completely silly to bring up all this drivel and nonsense of old times.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) has lost his balance.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) could surely listen to the reading of this point.

MR. PORTER: This is not your struggle.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order, the hon. Member (Mr. Salsberg) was reading from a document in writing. I suggest that the committee should hear him through before the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) interrupts. I say that because the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) made an attempt to --

MR. PORTER: It is a private quarrel now.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is trying to drown out the reading of Conservative propaganda, and I want all Conservative propaganda to get a fair hearing.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: You have done it again, I was not quite sure whether I was right or not, I had quąlms, that is right.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is afraid to have that 9th point read out in full and he is trying to stop me but I can start again and --

MR. PORTER: Read it again.

MR. SALSBERG: I can start all over again.

MR. PORTER: Read the whole 22.

MR. SALSBERG: So as to make sure it will be clearly on the record, but I will not, in view of the fact that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is looking at the clock and I want to accommodate him. I shall, therefore, continue from where the hon.

Minister (Mr. Porter) so rudely interrupted me and end that point.

"However, it is clearly understood that this change will not affect the authority of the local school boards".

Now Mr. Chairman, I suggest that it is abundantly clear, it is crystal clear for all who have eyes to see, ears to hear and a mind to digest reason and argument, that ithis point deals with the taxes on home and farm land, that is what it deals with. It was a promise made by the Conservative Party to ease the municipal tax burden by paying 50% of school costs and thereby reduce --

MR. PORTER: Costs as they were then, that is what it says.

MR. SALSBERG: The cost for education which property owners have to bear and to the outlandish and unsupportable suggestion of the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) that the reference was to costs at that time I will say that I am quite prepared to submit this point to the heads of the Department of English in the Ministry of Education for them to tell us whether the words of that point refer only to that year or as a permanent arrangment. I am sure that the Department of English will decide as every other person in the province will decide, that it was a pledge clearly undertaken to relieve the home owners, the owners of farm land, of 50% of the cost of education.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You are forgetting about their statute of limitations.

MR. SALSBERG: No, but I will be very glad to have you take over when I am finished. There is much to remind them of but at this time I want to re-establish

the fact that insofar as Toronto is concerned, that goes for the taxpayers and the report of the Minister of Education (Mr. Porter), the overwhelming majority of people correctly conclude that the government failed to keep its promise, that they were misled and they insist that the government live up to its promise to pay at least 50%. They are not even now reminding them that it was promised as an initial subject implying that as the years go by that the government would assume the full cost but at least 50%, they have a right to expect that, they do expect that, they ask for it and I hope the government will certainly live up to its promise, otherwise, they will justly be charged as they are now that having failed to live up to a pledge solemnly given to the electors and to the hon. members from outside Toronto, I want to say that the people of this city have no objection to the government paying a higher rate than 50%. In fact, they would like it to be as high as will be necessary to bring the level of education in every part of the province up to the standard at least that prevails in Toronto. All I am asking for is that a floor be put under the grants and that floor be 50% as was promised.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, in order that the Minister may be able to answer, I also am a little bit concerned about special grants situation.

MR. PORTER: Which vote is this?

MR. MILLARD: Vote 51, items 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Now, I notice there is a natural increase in items 5 and 6 of the special legislative grants. I assume from reading the Royal Commission's Report on

Education where the recommendation was to stop these special grants, now, what is the view of the Department or of the government on this question of special grants, because I note here -- I asked a question the other day -- the other evening when we were talking about this Department and Estimates regarding kindergartens -- the same amount is given as a special grant this year for kindergartens as for last year and yet it is the policy of the Department of Education to extend kindergartens and I assume that is why there is a special grant for kindergartens. Then, when you come to the question of agricultural education, a special department within our elementary and in our secondary schools, I notice there too that they will continue and I assume that these inducements are given by way of special grants to try to get local school boards to participate in these extra-curricular activities, and I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) why there is not a larger grant for extending kindergartens and for extending agricultural education.

(TAKE "J" FOLLOWS)

I notice less in the new grant system, particularly in the city of Toronto, where there was a considerable drop in the amount of grants given for vocational purposes. Apparently the same thing is happening this year, by and large, though there is a grant of $15,000. more under special legislative grants, item 2, for shop and home economics.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Education (Mr.Porter) to explain what the policy of the Department is in regard to special grants to encourage kindergartens which are on a permissive basis at the moment and in view of the education report recommending lowering the school age and getting our children started to school earlier. I would like to ask what is the policy in regard to these special grants. Is it the intention to gradually eliminate them in favour of the general grant to the local school teacher or are we going to continue to hand out these special grants as an inducement to support these special departments, in the elementary and secondary schools?

MR. PORTER: I think the most I can say about this at the present time is that our policy with respect to these special grants is that we expect to discontinue them as special grants as rapidly as possible but we do not think we should just suddenly drop them; we think eventually they should be incorporated in the general system of grants and be on an even basis with everything else. But at the present time I think I indicated the other night in a case of kindergartens, for instance, it is true that we are in favour of kindergartens. Whether it is quite right to say it is our policy to press or to promote kindergartens, that might not be quite accurate, because ---

MR. MILLARD : There is no promotion in this; it is $20,000. this year and it was $20,000. last year.

MR. PORTER: No; but the limitation on kindergartens, of course, is placed on teachers and the local decision to proceed. That is the situation with respect to kindergartens. We anticipate that all we will need this year, according to what we can estimate,

is what is in the Estimates here. I am afraid I cannot assist the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) any further.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This vote, No. 51, is in the amount of $48,187,000.00, which, I believe, is the largest vote in the Estimates. Perhaps that is worthy of two minutes silence, or something of that sort, because it is undoubtedly the largest vote in the history of Ontario.

MR. PORTER: It has not invoked any silence so far.

MR. JOLLIFFE : Not yet. I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and to the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh), that this vote really ought to be broken down more if it is possible to do so. I believe the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) was the opposition financial critic at one time. I think he will appreciate the point I am making. Both in the public accounts and in the Estimates this vast sum is dealt with in a few words. It is true that there are this year six different items. It may be that there are practical difficulties in the way of giving a further breakdown, but it does seem to me a collosal sum to vote under such general headings. It would be a very large sum in Ottawa. I venture to say it would be a very large vote at Westminister. I would appreciate it very much if the hon. Minister of Education (Mr.Porter) and the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) would give that some consideration in the coming year. It seems to me that the practice of allowing these very large votes to build up without sufficient definition is not a very good one.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to consider that. The vote is, of course, a very huge one, when one looks at a vote of $48 million, which verges on $50 million.

MR. JOLLIFFE: A vote as much as the total budget 15 years ago.

MR. FROST: Yes. Half as much as the budget six or seven years ago. I say to the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) that these things, of course, have grown up in many ways unexpectedly. I remember six years ago, in 1945, we were battling with the first increase of these grants from around $8,500,000. up to $25 million. It is almost unbelievable to think that $25 million -- which was an amount the hon.member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) will recollect he estimated at that time -- would be required to pay approximately half the cost of education. In the intervening six years that that should have increased to $48 million, is almost unbelievable. That is what has taken place. I agree that, perhaps, there might be a way of further amplifying these things in the accounts.

It is just six or seven years ago now that the House was considering Estimates of $23 million for school grants and municipalities. This year that amount is something in the neighbourhood of $100 million. Those are enormous things. Looking back over the years perhaps there are things with respect to which we would have preferred a different course. In the main these things have been of tremendous benefit to all people. When one looks at all municipalities and surveys the position of our municipalities one cannot help but wonder what their position would have been if it had not been for these tremendous sums of money expended. We will certainly give what the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) has said, consideration, because it is a huge amount of money. Perhaps there would be a way of setting this up in the accounts and bringing it down in the Accounts giving more details here.

MR. JOLLIFFE : As an example, I understand the text book grant is within that figure.

MR. FROST: That is correct.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is something that can be specified.

MR. MCEWING: With respect to item 4, the cost of education for non-resident pupils, particularly in the secondary class, has jumped from $310,000. to $580,000., almost double, in the one year. Can the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) explain the change in the grant?

MR. PORTER: We found last year that much more was required than had been estimated. After all, it was pretty difficult for the department to tell too far in advance into what this situation will develop within a year because it is beyond our control.

MR. McEWING: The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) means there was not enough last year?

MR. PORTER: No; that is with respect to the number of non-resident pupils who would be taking advantage of some other school. That is where these grants come in. Last year it cost more than we estimated. This year we are trying to provide for sufficient which will, we think, take care of the actual demand.

MR. McEWING: I wondered whether the grant was doubled or not.

Vote 51 agreed to.

On Vote 52.

Mr. W.H. TEMPLE (High Park): I am very glad to notice down at the bottom of Vote 52 an item for temperance education.

MR. PORTER: It was put there entirely for the member for High Park (Mr. Temple).

MR. TEMPLE: Having noticed this particular item, I at first thought that the government had displayed one of its very rare flashes of wisdom and that there were two digits on the end of the vote making it $500,000; but, upon scrutinizing it a little closer, I find it is only $5,000. I wonder if the hon. Minister for Education (Mr.Porter) would inform the House in his usual kind and capable manner just how he intends to spend this pitiful sum of money.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Third line from the bottom up.

MR. PORTER: I have another book here.

MR. McEWING: It jumped kind of fast.

MR. PORTER: Temperance, raised from $1,000. to $5,000., which is an increase of 500%.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: If that is not an indication that our heart is in the right place I do not know what would be. Entirely as a result of the persistency of the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Temple) in pursuing this subject, we have increased that item 500%. If that is not good enough I do not know what is.

This does not touch, of course, the general subject of temperance as it comes into the general courses of education in connection with physical fitness and other subjects which are dealt with in the school room. The Temperance Education Association is an association of long standing which has received a grant from year to year for a long time.

INSERT: "It seeks to encourage young people of Ontario to accept the findings of Science in relation to the action of alcohol on the human organism, the aim being to promote good health through temperance and thus better citizens. The association distributes scientific temperance literature in the secondary schools.

We find that their work is suitable and very effective. It is right to the point. It is a very fine piece of work they do. That amount is what they would need to provide additional literature and other facilities of that kind for the coming year. Of course, this does not cover all their activities. That is not all of their revenue. It is a voluntary association which collects money.

MR. McEWING: Would the hon. Minister of Education (M r. Porter) tell us how many schools there are which that covers?

MR. FROST: No, no; it is a society. Mr. Stewart ---

MR. PORTER: You mean how many schools getting literature from this association?

MR. McEWING: Yes.

MR. PORTER: 450.

MR. TEMPLE: I would like to make another comment on this particular item. I am sure the House will realize the liquor interests have huge sums of money spent in indirect forms of advertising. I am thinking of the enormous cocktail bars in the main cities of the province and the bright lights outside of liquor outlets in the cities, with the result that many of our young people are being attracted into these liquor selling places by the inducements of entertainment, music and television, floor shows and so forth. They are going into them unfortunately, without having sufficient acquaintanceship with the dangers of alcohol. I was informed by one of the Y.W.C.A. secretaries in Toronto that 75% of the illegitimate births which were brought to her attention were the result of liquor outlets in this city. I say to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) that is a very serious situation. It occurred to me would it be possible for the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) to instruct our secondary schools that a course in education should be undertaken in every classroom with respect to that problem?

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I might tell the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Temple) that this is really only a segment of what is being done. Actually, through the Liquor Control Board, when the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) was there, there was started a research section in the Liquor Control Board. That was under Professor Archibald of the University of Toronto. Last Fall Professor Archibald was transferred to the Foundation on Alcoholism which has quite a considerable item in its estimates for this work.

The problem arose, and I imagine I had more to do with that particular matter than the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter), during the Fall. What happened was that with respect to this work Professor Stuart was doing for which there was $1,000. in last year's Estimates, it was in the estimation of the Department of Education quite a valuable work. It was decided not to interfere with that at any time but to increase the amount. This amount is auxiliary to the other work which is being done by the Foundation. It may be that next year some of this will be coordinated under the one head, but it was felt desirable that this year that we should not interfere with the work Dr. Stuart is doing. Therefore, his appropriation was increased and the matter was left with the Department of Education to make an estimate to the Department of Health. You will see a special item in there under The Alcoholism Research Foundation. Particulars can be given at that time.

MR. TEMPLE: I have this observation to make, Mr. Chairman. I was interested in the term "education" in the schools. I presume from the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) answer there is nothing being done directly in the schools except in a voluntary effort by the teachers.

MR. FROST: No, no.

MR. TEMPLE: The government has been making research into this business for so long I have given up hope of ever finding an answer to it.

MR. PORTER: As I have explained on several occasions -- I do not expect this will satisfy any extremists with respect to this matter ---

MR. TEMPLE: I am not an extremist.

MR. PORTER: I think it is sound and right to treat and attack the whole problem in the proper way without putting it in the spotlight as if it was some subject of dazzling attraction to a

lot of people who should know better. There are courses of study carried on in the elementary and secondary schools as part of the general course in health. It is one of the aspects of temperance and health education. It is not emphasized with the screaming headlines and Hollywood techniques.

MR. SALSBERG: Or, fanfare.

MR. PORTER: It is treated as an education subject in the classroom in its proper place along with everything else which is considered in the course on health, and so on. I have on other occasions outlined to some extent the particular courses which deal with this. Some hon. members have said certain things. Of course, some hon. members of this House are not impressed with anything I say in this regard because it is not spectacular. It is good, sound, prosaic material which has no sex appeal.

MR. WISMER: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in two of these special grants. They are somewhat related. I have something I would like to say about it. First, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) a question: there is an item of $500. for the Ontario Society of Artists. The question I would like to ask first is what is the reason for making that grant? What is the reason of the government for making the grant?

MR. PORTER: The Ontario Society of Artists is the recognized society of artists presiding and carrying on in this province. We have supported them to that extent. We consider art one of the cultural activities which should be supported certainly in this way.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It could be.

MR. PORTER: The Society endeavours to stimulate public interest by exhibitions, demonstrations and lectures. I understand by reason of reading the newspapers that the exhibition they had the other night did that very thing. There were a lot of people there, anyway.

MR. WISMER: I am glad the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) suggests that it is for the encourggement of Art and the development of art in this province that the grant is made.

MR. PORTER: It is an educational function which we support.

MR. WISMER: I am not an artist or would-be artist, like the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter).

MR. PORTER: In which category do you include me -- as a would-be or a be?

MR. WISMER: I did not say anything about has-beens. The matter which concerns me in respect of this is that the Ontario Society of Artists is a very old Association and certainly has done I think, a lot to develop fine art in the province of Ontario. It is not for me to say whether we should assist one form of art as distinguished from another. I am aware that there is more than one school of thought among artists. The hon. Minister of Education (Mr.Porter) made mention of the showing in this city by the Society.

If my information is correct out of about 87 pictures shown less than 30 came from the group of Macdonalds, Thompsons, the great names---

MR. MACLEOD: Is that Walter Thomson?

MR. WISMER: --in Ontario and Canadian art. There are moderns of various kinds and various types. Frankly, I see no reason why they should not be shown, but I think it is rather alarming in a sense, that people like Forbes and Manley Macdonald, and so on, should resign from this Society and that---

MR. PORTER: Do you think we should cut this out?

MR. WISMER: No. I am coming to what I consider what we might do about it. I am not prepared now or later ot suggest you cut it out , but I am raising this question because I think it is of some importance. As I say, I am not arguing for one art or the other but I think, as public funds are being spent to encourage the development of art in the province of Ontario, and we are teaching art in our schools, this has some bearing on the development of teachers. I am not taking sides with those who say "I do not like the sort of art they are taught in schools." I am not on my feet for that purpose. Maybe it is good art, maybe it is bad art. Maybe they have good and bad teaching methods; I do not know. I do know there is some coneern about it. What I am really concerned about is this: if we are to encourage art in the general sense in which the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) says this grant is given-- and I accept what he sais -- I think you have to encourage for example people who paint portraits. We have a real interest in having good portrait painters.

MR. SALSBERG: Do you expect to be hung?

MR. WISMER: We have an interest, of course, in the development of trends in art, especially good trends in art. When a show is given and people begin to resign as a result of it I think it is time for us to have some concern and look into the situation a little more carefully. I find that what has happened is that those who may be considered to be part of the rational school, if you like, or some name of that sort--- because of the way the selection is made now in the Society with respect to pictures has a ppor chance. The moderns are in command. They are in full control of the Society. What can you do about it?

MR. PORTER: Perhaps we had better cut this out.

MR. WISMER: I see in Montreal they have adopted a somewhat different method. What they have done down there is to create two juries, one to consider the art of the more classical and rational type and what of that type of painting should be hung in the exhibition, and what of the so-called moderns should be hung; in other words, quite separate juries consider quite separate classes of painting. I do not know if that is the answer, but that is being done in Montreal. As the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) pointed out, the exhibition is one of the places in which we encourage not only the artist but the public to be interested in the arts and artists. Therefore, if we are interested in encouraging this surely we are interested in encouraging the whole field of art, of painting, no any one section, regardless of whatever kind of fight may go on among the artists, themselves. That is their own fight. What are we encouraging with public funds? I might make various suggestions. If the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) has anything to say in regard to this I would like the answer now. I also want to speak later in regard to the Art Gallery of Toronto and I do not want to mix the two up.

MR. PORTER: I thought artists in this country were mature enough to run their own affairs. This is their organization. Some of them may resign. Because a few of them resign I do no know why we have to pay any attention to that particularly. This represents the broad group of Ontario Artists in different fields of art. Whether they are painting good pictures, bad pictures or indifferent pictures, I do not know. It is the best we have. At least the public likes them

so much that the public went down to the showing in a greater number of thousands than they had ever done before at any of these exhibitions. It seems to be stirring public interest, which is exactly what we would like to do.

MR. WISMER: At the top of the list is another grant $6,000. to the Art Gallery of Toronto. Presumably, that is, also, for the encouragement of art in the province of Ontario. I should say it is a good grant. I do not wish to go into history on this, but this $6,000 is the payment of public funds of the province of Ontario to the Art Gallery of Toronto, which I believe is supported by further public funds. It seems to me that it is time a little more thought should be given to it, if public funds are going to be used for some of the things the Art Gallery is now purchasing. As I said, in talking about the other grant, I am not taking sides in this.

(TAKE "K" FOLLOWS)

I think we should have some concern about this. You go down to the Art Gallery and you find there are actually pushed out of the limelight while they were at one time very much in the limelight.

Down there, there are two busts which can hardly be called "art" if beauty has anything to do with art. There are two busts, two women's heads recently purchased in Europe by the Art Gallery. I have no idea the price they paid for them, if they paid very much, certainly as a laymen looks at them, they over-paid. Frankly, I think the hon. members of this House should go down and take a look at those two heads just to see how hideous some things can be, yet they were purchased by the Art Gallery of Toronto as objects of art. As a matter of fact, these two heads are so fantastic that I had pictures taken of them so anyone interested could see what remarkable things they are.

MR. PORTER: Do you want this cut out? Do you want us to cut the grants because of them?

MR. WISMER: I do know one thing, the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) could very definitely do is to assure himself, before he sends the money down to the Art Gallery of Toronto as to how much they pay for these things.

MR. PORTER: I am not a connoisseur of this sort of thing. I would not know whether it was good, bad, or indifferent.

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): You do not appreciate fine art.

MR. SALSBERG: What is the matter with this?

MISS MACPHAIL: Take a look at it.

MR SALSBERG: Do you want calendar pictures?

MR. WISMER: I am not surprised that the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) is so excited when he sees them. I noticed he Turned them over to see who the sculptor was.

MR. MACLEOD: It looks like the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) or Walter Thompson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us get on with the vote.

MR. PORTER: Picasso is a great artist. I would like to see it.

MISS MACPHAIL: If it was a man's head, I would not mind so much.

MR. PORTER: I know that everybody is very "high-brow" about this, but I will reserve judgment until I see it.

MR. WISMER: I respect the hon. Minister's (Mr. Porter) point of view on that. I think he should go down and see it, and I would be very interested in hearing the report of his visit.

The reason I am raising this is because these are public funds we are spending; public funds are going into this sort of thing. I have seen sculptor of what might be called "modern art" but there is one part of themodern school which I think we should be pretty careful about before any public money is spent.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I may tell the hon. member (Mr. Wismer) that we are careful. I can assure him of that. But this is a very difficult matter. If you to to an exhibition of Ontario or even Canadian artists, what some people regard as art, I might be quite unable to appreciate. I like nice pictures, and because I do like them, I am considered as a heathen.

It may be we are not able to appreciate them. This is a highly scientific matter, and we are getting into the realm of experts, and the amount we show in the estimate, is very, very small.

MR. PORTER: As far as I am concerned, I like that picture very much.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: That is a Picasso, and Picasso is good. I would like to look at them more often.

MR. SALSBERG: I am really sorry that this discussion has started. I might say that I admire Picasso politically, but not artistically. How do your like that? I fail to understand many of Picasso's paintings and although he is what is known as a "self-confessed communist", I will say to the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) that in Russia they do not like them. It will be a sorry day for art in this province when politicians assume the role of art critics. Let us not become panicky, alarmed and jittery because a couple of artists resigned. Let us find out why one approves and another disapproves and we may learn to better appreciate the works of Ontario artists. Let us give them more money, and lots of encouragement rather than try to decide in this Legislature what is artistically right and what is wrong.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WISMER: This is the sort of thing which worries me. I do not wish the Legislature to decide what is good art or bad art. I will not read it, but I have a letter from Mr. Kennedy Forbes, who wrote to

the hon. Minister of Public Works in Ottawa when he was commissioned to paint a portrait of one of the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, and it was to be accepted by the Department of Public Works. He declined to be placed in that position.

I am not very much concerned whether the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) likes Picasso or Matisse.

MR. PORTER: This is an Art Gallery problem and if they can obtain samples of representative work, why should they not do it? That is the sort of thing they should do.

MR. WISMER: Well, I will be through in two minutes. There is running through one part of this modern art a set of symbols. If you look at the Picture carefully enough you will find this set of symbols. There is one set which even if you look at it you do not see it, but it indicates to people all over the world that you are at work. It is the symbol for destroying and is used to create the impression that our Christian civilization is disappearing.

I will not go into the technique of this. You will find in others sex symbols. If you mention these things you have the finger pointed at you, and it is indicated that you have a depraved mind and do not appreciate art. One actually sees these things all over the world. We ought to understand it. The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) say they do not understand this. It is an important thing, and we must understand it so that this Legislature will not have to go out and point the finger

and say "that is one of these pictures", to their people again.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh yes, you can, outside the House.

MR. WISMER: Let us be sure of that. These people who are using art to assist the anhilist school to destroy our Christian and Democratic civilization -- let us be sure about it before we spend any money of the taxpayers of Ontario to assist that work. That is what I ask. I am not saying that what I shewed you in the Art Gallery is part of that. But it is there. What you can see in pictures now being painted and hung in exhibitions are these things.

MR. PORTER: Where can we see some of these rabid pictures?

MR. WISMER: May I remind the House of the embarrassing situation the United States government got itself into?

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, I agree with what the hon. Member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) has said. I think if you reviewed the pictures at the present time displayed in the Art Gallery, you might also agree with him. I have seen them.

For the information of the House, I would like to point out that inthe Evening Telegram of a few nights ago, they had a few of these pictures. I direct the attention of the House to some of them. Here is a painting of a politician -- had it said "a Tory politician" one might agree with it.

(TAKE "L" FOLLOWS)

MR. PORTER: You are just too sensitive.

MR. DENNISON: This is an example of abstract art, and to look at it one would think that it was the -- that you were looking down into a Toronto garbage truck that had just picked up a bunch of wet paper from a household.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN hon. MEMBER: I would say that is a very accurate description.

MR. DENNISON: Now, take the picture of a rooster, you see, two eyes, some hairs, the feet have three claws but one grows out from the side of the other claw instead of going out properly from the foot. Take the other picture, this is headed "Release". A handless, footless, headless creature in a nightgown is throwing arms in all direction with a volcano in the background.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: Now, Mr. Chairman, that kind of art is wonderful as a relief for the people painting it, but that is all that anybody gets out of it. But most people going to an art display -- and I have taken many of them down -- they are horrified, they are repelled by that kind of art, and that art I do not think will ever be art for the common person, and that is the art I am interested in.

I do not think this revival of mysticism, this taking us back to astrology, back to the days of the medicine man, back to the days when our ancestors scribbled weird designs on the walls of a cave, I do not think that can be uplifting to any society, and the cult that parades that in the name of modern art, I do not agree with, I

think it is a decadent form of art and I think that we should realize that modern art does not need to go into partnership with nonsense and distortion in order to be art. Modern art does not need to be afraid of truth, modern art does need to be afraid of reality, and I would suggest in our grants to art and art galleries that we keep that in view. I do not think the public itself can afford to subsidize that kind of bizarre creation.

Votes 52 and 53 agreed to.

On Vote 54.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Chairman, on 54 I received a communication, along with other hon. members of this House I presume, from the Superannuated Teachers Assocation, asking if the government would undertake to pay a supplementary allowance to some of our old teachers who retired prior to April 1st, 1949, and whose pension is inadequate.

I might say that some of these teachers are receiving as little as $40. and $45. This is money that they contributed themselves to the Teachers' Pension Fund prior to the time of their retirement. Again, I would like to make this point, Mr. Chairman, and that is if the Federal Government at Ottawa had granted the old age pension without a means test, these teachers would not be in the plight that they are in at the present time. However, the Ottawa Government has failed to live up to its promises and the teachers are living in very straightened circumstances, and I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) if in this particular vote

for pensions for superannuated teachers, there is no supplementary allowance at least until such time as the old age pension is paid.

MR. PORTER: Well now, of course the hon. member (Mr. Temple) will recall that when we brought in this new Act a couple of years ago, we did make some provision then for those who were -- it was really quite an unusual thing for a government to do, because the hon. member (Mr. Temple) will realize that once we look back and take into consideration the great many people who are not in on the new schemes, we do not know where the end would come. Those are the sort of things we have to consider.

I really do not think there is any way, in view of the present position, of doing much about that. We are in hope, we anticpate there will be an old age pension without a means test January 1st -- that is what we were hoping and that would relieve the situation very substantially.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): But is it fair to rely on that?

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Well, we certainly have done everything.

MR. PORTER: We have done everthing we can.

MR. FROST: I should not imagine there would be anything that would hold this up much longer. As you know, we here have agreed on the form of the amendment, we have agreed to enter into the deal, we have urged the Federal Government to get ahead with it. More than that, I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) will agree it is pretty hard for us to do.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) -- this has nothing to do

with the OSA -- the amount of $100,000. to the Ontario College of Art is the same as last year, whereas your grants to all the other universities in the province have been increased about 10 or 15 per cent over last year. Now, this institution teaches a good many things besides abstract art. It teaches ceramics, advertising art, sculpture, pottery, textiles, metalwork -- in other words, it is the training ground for industrial artists as well as other artists, and I wonder if the grants could not be increased in line with the grants paid to other universities.

MR. PORTER: Which is this?

MR. DENNISON: Item 10 on 53. I know we have passed it.

MR. PORTER: Well, the situation is that in the quarters they have now, that is really all we can use, but that is enough money to carry on in the buildings that we have. They are very badly in need of a new building there as well as in many other institutions, and they are crowded, as many other people are, but we find that is all we need in order to carry it on. We would like to have larger quarters and expand, because it is a growing institution.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): On 54, Superannuation to Teachers, I just wanted to say that these are not people that were superannuated at public expense, they were paying in through a lifetime and a lifetime of low salaries and so on. I really would like to see from the Consolidated Revenue Fund some gesture, at any rate, made towards the teachers who were superannuated and do not come

under the new provision that was passed in 1949. Can there be any hope given to those teachers other than the old-age pension without means test?

MR. PORTER: Well, of course, we did what we thought was as much as we can do a couple of years ago for them. I agree with the hon. member (Miss MacPhail). I would like to do it but then we have to take the whole business into consideration.

Vote No. 54 agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Take the Miscellaneous item and we will try to clear up one or two small items here. It is so late, perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) would prefer, rather than call the Department of Reform Institutions, that we leave that until tomorrow afternoon and perhaps try to clear up one or two minor items here. We have only ten minutes and we will try to adjourn the House at six o'clock.

Page 107. Miscellaneous.

On Vote 194.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): This item, of course, Mr. Chairman, is just a bookkeeping item that appears in every year's accounts or estimates. In the Public Accounts there is, following U-3, several pages giving the full details of this item, which is a sort of a cross item.

Votes 194 and 195 agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Now take the Provincial Auditor, page 79.

Vote 138 agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): The Prime Minister's Department might be taken. Page 78.

(TAKE "M" FOLLOWS)

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Page 78, Office of the Prime Minister.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up ---

MR. FROST: If you would like to hold it up it is all right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You can hold it if you like, I was going to take this opportunity, in this particular department, of asking the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) about that broadcast of his. We are all so anxious to hear, I have not read it myself or heard it myself so I did not raise the question again today, I am very considerate about matters of this kind. The galleries were full at 2:00 o'clock and I did not raise the question today, but the galleries are not full now and I am not proposing it should be read now, but it is getting late and I can assure the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that we are waiting with baited breath to hear that broadcast.

MR. FROST: I might say the first I heard of this broadcast was on Thursday night.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We drew it to your attention as tactfully as we knew how.

MR. FROST: Well, I have enquired since that time and found that this broadcast was apparently prepared by CBC in collaboration, I think [illegible] with the Department of Education. Actually, I understand the broadcasts are written by CBC and they have had broadcasts on Mr. St.Laurent and a number of others.

MR. SALSBERG: Joe Stalin.

MR. FROST: Well, they have a lot of them, anyway. I thought, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I might try and get all

of these broadcasts and table them and hon. members can see themselves what they are about. The fact is, I have not run across any living soul that heard this broadcast about myself so apparently it did not attract very much interest. I have not run across any living soul yet who heard the broadcast but I will try and get copies and table all these broadcasts.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) must understand we have not the same interest in Mr. Stalin or Mr. St.Laurent as we have in the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), nor, has the Department of Education for that matter. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) of Ontario is one thing ---

MR. PORTER: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is too modest.

MR. JOLLIFFE: -- and these other citizens are entirely different matters but we do feel it ought to be read to the House and as I say, I have not heard it or read it but I have heard enough about it to feel sure the House should be given an opportunity --

MR. PORTER: You are talking about it to that extent and never heard it?

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) made a commitment about it.

MR. FROST: The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) would not like to add to my embarrassment being a modest citizen.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If it is read by the hon. member for York North (Mr. MacKenzie) we would all enter into the spirit of the thing and something good enough for the ears of our children is not to be withheld from the ears

of the hon. members of this House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Votes 135 and 136 agreed to.

On Vote 137.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There was considerable over-spending in the department of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) last year. Most of which, I understand, was due to the advent of the Racing Commission.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: B ut not all of it?

MR. FROST: Yes, it is practically all the Racing Commission. I would say to the hon. members that Vote 137 is the Racing Commission and that amount is largely the amount received on the per diem licence fee which was not heretofore charged to the former organization, I.R.C.A. -- I think those are the initials. When that went out of commission the amounts that they had collected were added into the fees and licences of the commission and, therefore, this amount here is very largely collected from the tracks and does not represent really a new expenditure.

MR. H.L. WALTERS (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would be willing, if I take my seat in a couple of minutes and be a good little boy he will allow me a little bit of leeway when the Racing Commission bill comes up?

MR. FROST: Oh, yes, surely, I was holding the Bill up. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) asked that that be the case and I am holding it over.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Just one question, why does the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) retain this Commission under his Department? I am not objecting to it but I am

asking what unsuspected or unknown characteristic of the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) leads him to take interest in it.

MR. FROST: Nobody else will take it. I have tried to pass it on to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) and the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) and they would not .

Vote 137 agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Page 60, Department of Insurance, Vote 94.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of matters that some of us would like to discuss under this Vote. It would not take very long but I am afraid there is not time tonight.

MR. FROST: Very well, we will hold it over.

MR. Chairmain, I move that the Committee do now rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T.L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee begs leave to report progress and asks leave to sit again, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in moving that the House do now adjourn I just want to repeat what I said at the commencement of today's session, that tomorrow we will go ahead for about an a hour on the Order Paper on the B ills and after that we will go into Estimates and continue through with Estimates till eleven o'clock at night.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now

adjourn.

MR. MacLEOD: What Department?

MR. FROST: Well, we will do Reform Institutions for one, we could do the Department of Highways, Department of Public Works, Department of Health -- the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) is not here but I am sure we can go ahead with that. I suppose, the Department of the Attorney General.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, give him a rest.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at six of the clock p.m.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

———•———

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

———•———

Volume XXXIV

TUESDAY, MARCH 20th, 1951

AFTERNOON SITTING

———•———

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and recinving petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

MR. R. ROBSON ((Hastings East): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the first Report of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, and move its adoption.

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: Mr. Robson, from the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, presents this as the First Report of the Committee:

"To the Honourable the Legislative Assembly
of the Province of Ontario.

Honourable members:-

Your Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization begs leave to present the following as its First Report:

'Your Committee beg to report the following Bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 129, 'An Act to Amend the Milk Control Act'.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(signed) ROSCOE ROBSON
Chairman"

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the Day.

Hon. G.A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the following:

(1) 45th Annual Report of the Ontario Municipal Board, December 31, 1950.

(2) Copies of Orders-in-Council Nos. 814 and 1538 under The Northern Development Act.

(3) Financial Statement of Municipal Loans for the Fiscal Year ended March 31, 1950.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the answer to question 42.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. C.H. MILLARD:(York West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the hon. members and to that of the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) a news report appearing in this morning's Toronto paper. The article is headed, "Poor lights, Few Police, Draw Deputation's Ire".

This took place in York Township, which is in part in the riding of York West, and I would like to quote from the article, because it tells its own story:

> " In the 20 years I've lived in the district, I've never seen a policeman," 'said Mrs. Herbert Crip, Criscoe St.' I think they're afraid to come into this isolated area.'
>
> The criminal assault on a 19-year-old girl last Tuesday night led to yesterda's deputation.
>
> 'This isn't the first attack of this kind,' said Mrs. Crips. There are mothers

here who can testify that this is a regular happening in our district.'

The deputation asked for immediate adequate lighting in the Henrietta-Runnymede area 'to make it more or less impossible for further malicious attacks to take place.'

The petition was signed by more than 360 names. It also sought additional police protection for the district north of St. Clair Ave. on Runnymede Rd.

'You could put a policeman at every corner, and this sort of thing would still happen,' said Councillor Saunders. 'Did you ever hear of a policeman catching a man in such an assault?'

'It seems a vigilante committee is what you need in your district,' said Councillor Chris Tonks.

Council Cashman, in whose ward the attack took place, said the lighting was very inadequate.

'The street lights are the old goose-neck type, there since 1876,' he said. 'If the street were properly lighted it would be some protection.'

Reeve Beech promised that the matter of police protection will be taken up with the police commission, and a full report on the lighting facilities will be forthcoming

immediately from the Hydro.

'I feel that council thinks this is just another deputation,' said Mrs. Crips. 'But to the mothers in the district it is a very real and desperate problem. We never have a moment's peace when our daughters are out in the evening.' "

Now, Mr. Speaker, the mother of the young girl in question, which lead to this deputation because of an attack last Tuesday night, contacted me by telephone this morning, and asked me if there was anything which could be done by way of hurrying up an investigation into this affair and more adequate police protection in this area. All that I could reply to her was that I would bring the matter to the attention of the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) and of this House.

It seems that we are paying supplementary amounts to the municipalities in order that they can provide adequate police forces for their needs, and apparently the reference made here to the fact that no policeman has been seen in the area, is a reference to the fact that no policeman appears on that beat, and the only protection they seem to have is a cruiser.

This attack took place at 10:30 at night, and when the Mother returned from a ratepayers' meeting in the district, she came home to find her daughter on the way to the hospital because of the malicious attack on this young woman. Naturally the mother and all mothers in the area are particularly concerned. It is a matter

of public concern, and I would like to know if the government cannot do something to aid the municipal Council to investigate and provide the necessary police protection for that particular area.

I do not think -- and I think the government will agree with me -- that we have reached the place where we must set up a vigilante group of citizens to afford this kind of protection in our municipalities.

This municipality happens to lie adjacent to a very large city, and they have not only their own population to police, but in many cases a visiting population from outside their particular municipality.

I strongly urge that in cases such as this the government, through the Department of the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) make every effort to have this investigation carried on immediately, to make sure there is adequate police protection, as well as better lighting which seems to be necessary.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, now that this matter is drawn to the attention of the House, I may say that the policing of your township, of course, is done by the local police force, which is responsible to the Police Commission, consisting of Judge Macdonnell, Magistrate Martin, and Mr. William Veitch, the Reeve.

I shall certainly enquire as to the conditions there, to see whether there is adequate policing in that district. I may say, if it is found in that district that the feeling in York Township is that the policing is inadequate to handle the situation which may arise, it is always open for them to enter into an agreement with the Provincial

police, as many municipalities have done, whereby the Provincial police will provide the necessary men to police the municipality, if they so wish.

I assure the hon. member (Mr. Millard) that I shall enquire into it.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 12

HIGHWAYS IMPROVEMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: mTwelth Order, Second reading of Bill No. 93, "An Act to amend the Highways Improvement Act", Mr. Doucett.

Hon. G.H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 93.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee (Mr. Patrick in the Chair).

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 2.

THE BOILERS AND PRESSURE VESSELS ACT, 1951

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 80, "The Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act, 1951", Mr. Daley.

On Section 1.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, is the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) able to tell us now whether he has consulted all of the employee groups concerned in this?

Hon. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, this Bill, as the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) must know went through Committee.

MR. DENNISON: I was not a member of the Committee.

MR. DALEY: It was dealt with in Committee, and as I expressed, when the Committee reported to the House, I appreciate very much the co-operation and help the Committee had been in approving this Bill. It passed the Committee without amendment. Many of the sections were discussed, and we had the advantage of having our Chief Boiler Inspector there, and a representative of the Trade Union, who was given an opportunity to speak, and while he did not speak particularly on this Bill, he did speak on another matter which has to do with the compulsory certification of plumbers, and steamfitters, and so forth.

In toto, this Bill was accepted by the Committee, and I did not feel it was necessary to make any further investigation.

Sections 1 to 48 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 80 reported.

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.4

THE RACING COMMISSION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 37, "An Act to amend The Racing Commission Act", Mr. Frost.

On Section 1.

MR. WALTERS (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, I think my remarks should be made at the outset because they are rather of a general nature. I was very sorry to notice in the paper that the Commission had made a decision already respecting night racing and while the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) did give some arguments here in the House recently as to his reasons for that, I think there are some very strong arguments on the other side. Last year, when the Racing Commission Bill came in I was ill, I had spoken previously in favour of setting up a Racing Commission and I have not changed my mind since as to the reasons I had. There are some good reasons for having set up that Commission and I am not going to be too critical of the action of that Commission. There are some things that have happened but since it has been a "first", in this province I will reserve criticisms in the hope that many of the things that have transpired will be rectified in the coming year.

Firstly, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) wishes to be fair to all persons who constitute the racing public in the province and I think also he wants a Commission set up on the soundest basis. Now, this Commission as constituted now has only

two counterparts in the whole United States and that is the one in Massachusetts and the one in Maryland. May I say that the grapevine in these two Commissions have more trouble than all the rest of the Commissions in the United States. There, they have constituted all the power in a small Commission and one section of the racing population is very, very unhappy. Now, the same thing has transpired here. In New York and the other Racing Commissions they have split the power of the Racing Commission and that has worked out far more satisfactorily and I think New York is the best Racing Commission to model any other Racing Commission on. I do not say it is perfect, I do not think anything is perfect, the human elements must enter in but so far I think they have worked much more efficiently than any other Racing Commission. There they have done this, the Chairman comes from the Running horse Ranch, with him he has two Commissioners to work with the Running horse and he has three Commissioners to run with the trotting and pacing horses. He chairs the whole Commission.

MR. OLIVER: I wonder who wins?

MR. WALTERS: I have the whole business right here, I took the trouble to bring both the New York Racing Commission and the Maryland Commission, I wrote them for their whole set up, financial reports and everything else. Now, they have found night racing has done this for the trotting horse people, it has put the business right on its feet. It had this effect since it is followed mostly by the rural elements in the States, the little man, the farmer who has a pretty trim looking

little mare so he crosses that with a thoroughbred and gets a fair trotter or pacer. It has been a source of revenue to the rural elements and they are the people who essentially follow trotting and pacing. They have brought night racing there, and it has been rather successful; it has its defects as all sports that bring in the gambling element have defects, it brings in an element outside the sport itself but here is what they found, that it has cut down absenteeism from work because a lot of the city people are beginning to follow the night racing and the trotters and pacers. Formerly they followed the runners but all the runners run in the afternoon, consequently the sporting public who follow racing took a day off from work and go to the races but with night racing the rural element and the city people are going now.

It is a fact and I say the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should take particular note of this, it is a fact that the elements who follow trotters and pacers do not show the same gambling proclivities as people who follow the running horses. Even in the big stake races in the cities where they draw 20,000 to 25,000 people, it has been noted that only 30% of the people who go to the track ever go to the betting ring. It, therefore, follows that if trotters and pacers are to create the conditions and give the service to the people that they have been able to do in the States, they are going to have to have a gate.

They depend more on a gate than do the runners. As a matter of fact, you take any track right here in the city of Toronto, they can give a badge to everybody

that goes in the track and still make money because no racetrack with running horses in Canada has lost money and the figures prove that. After all, this government within the last five years has received somewhere close to 18 million dollars in revenue from running horses. The gambling turnover in one day at a running horse meet from the pari mutuel machines is about as much as what you would get in three days in trotting and pacing. I am not going to miss the opportunity of making a little crack here about our friend, the would-be Warwick of King and York Street, that is a little historical sequence for the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter).

MR. PORTER: Very interesting.

MR. WALTERS: Je said that night racing at Thorncliffe for trotters and pacers was something for the iron pickpockets. Let me say, the iron pickpockets at Woodbine take more from the public in one day than they would in three days with trotters and pacers. Furthermore, you cannot pick up a racing form and get any information on a trotter and pacer, therefore, trotting and pacing does not lend itself to our gambling friends outside the track. You get a program about an hour before the races start and on these programs you find some kind of a little chart drawn up by the steward of the trotting and pacing club giving you some background of the horses, whether pacing or trotting. There is a point that was puzzling me, I did ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) earlier in the Session as to whether he had made any overtures to Ottawa with respect to setting up a straight betting system with the pari-mutuel machines and cutting out the bookies

completely off the tracks. I think that is the element that has brought horse-racing more into disrepute, is the outside gambling element. The reason why I was in favour of night racing, I can foresee a time in the very near future when all these factors have been taken into consideration now in New York State are going to come home to us here, and I am wondering why there has been such terrific opposition from certain elements to night racing. Well, I can tell you why up to a point. I do not think a thoroughbred lends itself to night racing and I think the people who follow the thoroughbreds are just being a little selfish in this situation to the detriment of those people who are not breeding thoroughbreds for running. Thoroughbreds are by nature a very skittish sort of animal, a very difficult animal to race even in the daytime, whereas the trotters are a more settled type of animal and I think that the position is, they feel they are going to try to draw some of the customers away from the running races in the afternoon, I do not think that is true, as a matter of fact, in New York State at Saratoga, they run their running races in the afternoon and they run night races, pacers and trotters in the evening, and what happens? You have a certain class of track follower who goes every afternoon to the races and they draw the same crowds. Their gate and their crowds have not fallen down one little bit and yet, just a few hundred yards away there is a track all set up for pacers and trotters and they have their followers and one has not interfered with the other. As a matter of fact, it is rather remarkable if you go to a

pacing and trotting meet to find out how much the people who go there know about the sport, far more than the people who go to the thoroughbreds' meets. At the thoroughbreds' meets the people who are actually in the business know something about the horses, the jockeys, and that sort of thing, or some of your sources of information, the race-track touts, they know quite a bit about them but with pacers and trotters you meet the average person who follows these horses and he can tell you all about the driver, all about the horse, and he has no racing form. He has been following this business for years, it is a sport with him and I think a lot of people are beginning to take an interest. I think you should take all the factors into consideration and I think eventually you will come to the conclusion that you will bring in night racing and I think you might as well do it now.

Well, to go on to the Racing Commission itself, I wondered exactly how that Commission did function last year because it did not have very much power. Now, you have got some bitter, bitter warring people to be dealt with by the Commission. I am not talking about the war between pacers, trotters and runners, I am talking about the thoroughbreds' end of it and these people are really battling, otherwise we would not have had the Commission set up in the first place. Well, I do not want to drag this thing too long, Mr. Chairman, but I think eventually we will have night racing, I think taking all the factors into consideration, what has transpired in New York State, just in the one section and it transpires in other States, they came to the conclusion that night racing was a good thing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if you do want to help these people in the province of Ontario, the people have never had any government assistance, they carried on privately themselves, I think night racing is going to be a boon to the small racers, to the rural element because they are the people who are interested. And not only that we, here in Canada, when we go to a thoroughbred racing meet we face this, that about 90% of the horses running are not the best thoroughbreds. If you want good race horses of the calibre that you call "high Class" race horses you have to go to Kentucky or France and England and import them. Now, so far as the standard breeding horses are concerned, we raise just as good here in the province of Ontario as anywhere in America. As a matter of fact, they are coming over here looking for them. Now, if we have some encouragement for the breeding of these horses here in our own province I feel you are going to create a demand in this province. I think there are many hon. members on the other side who know tyat. I am not a rural hon. member, I am just a person interested in sport and it is a source of revenue to the province. I want to see it developed. I have nothing against thoroughbreds, I have followed them for years, I have driven pacers and trotters, not in races, but just for my own sport, and there is a great deal of sport in that. I would like the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to take the position of treating the people fairly and squarely. If he is afraid of the gambling element and the increase in gambling, I would say this, he should encourage the pacers and trotters and the gambling does not enter

nearly as much in that form of sport as with the thoroughbred. I will leave that with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). And if there is any other information he required I will be only too glad to give it to him, I have lots of it here.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I was sorry the hon. member (Mr. Walters) was not here when this Bill was discussed on second reading. Of course, in Committee stage this Bill is in, I think deals with some minor aspects of the present Act and here in Committee is hardly the place to discuss these things. However, the hon. member (Mr. Walters) was ill, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) raised the point, asked me to allow this Bill to stand over and I must say, Mr. Chairman, I was very happy to do so. I am quite impressed by what the hon. member (Mr. Walters) has said and the sincerity with which he has said it. I know he will regard what I say in the same light. After all, we are only looking for the truth and the best way to handle a very difficult matter. First of all, may I say that the Racing Commission was brought about last year to start on the straightening out of a very difficult problem and I am quite satisfied, Mr. Chairman, and I think the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) will agree that the Racing Commission has brought about improvement. Now, I would not for one monent say the Racing Commission has done everything correctly, I would not say that our present methods in the Racing Commission are the last word, because actually speaking, they are not. It may be

that what the hon. member (Mr. Walters) says about the New York situation is something which ultimately ought to come in here, that is, as regards the operation of the Commission, but, in the meantime, we are effecting improvements. I know, not only from what the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) has said, but some others have said who are connected with the racing business that the Racing Commission has undoubtedly raised the standard of racing in this province.

Now, we were right in having a Commission, two members of which are connected with, and are interested in, the thoroughbreds, or flat racing, and one member who is interssted in harness racing, with a Chairman as we have at the present time. I mean, that is the way the Commission functions at the present time. Whether that is the right method or not, we will learn by trial and error, it is not working too badly at the present time as far as that goes.

Now, on second reading we did discuss the matter of pari-mutuels and bookies and I confess to the House in the last year I learned a lot about the business. I do not think a year ago I appreciated the fact that bookies can operate in this province legally, but they can. I found that out, and I also found out there is really nothing I can do about it because it comes under the Dominion Law. I quite agree that it is in the book-makers' end of the business is where much of the difficulty arises, but I know the hon. member (Mr. Walters) will appreciate this, that in some of the small tracks, some of the small horse fairs in the province, books operate

quite legally, and they operate through the management of the fairs and the tracks and are a source of revenue to them.

(TAKE "C" ROLLOWS)

It is quite impossible to operate a pari-mutuel system in these small tracks at the Fall Fairs; it cannot be done; it is too expensive. That is one thing we learned during the year ; you cannot do that.

My idea previously was to do everything possible to regulate the bookies out of business, and carry the business through the pari mutuel machines. I found, because of the fact that it is impossible to operate parimutuels in very small Fall Fair tracks that I could not do that, and I did not want to hurt some of the Fall Fairs. Some of the Fall Fairs do not operate with the bookies at all. Coming from Lindsay, -- which is, I was going to say, the largest Fall Fair in Ontario,--

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, now, now.

MR. FROST: I must give the Canadian National Exhibition in Toronto first place,but there is a large Fall Fair in Lindsay,and there are no books licenced by the Fair Board or the track, and we have a lot of racing there.

MR.JOLLIFFE: Are there any unlicenced books?

MR. FROST: There may be. I have been there a good deal, On the other hand, tracks do licence bookies, and that is the problem you have to meet, and we have done what we could not help doing, and that is, leaving the situation alone.

Gambling comes under the Federal Criminal Code, and I have already referred to the House to the Raney reference here in 1922, which I think very definitely sets out the powers of the province and the Dominion in that regard.

Now, to come down to the question of night racing, and answer the question by the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) in that regard.

I have to confess this to the hon. member (Mr. Walters);

I have listened to his arguments, and some of them have quite a strong appeal to me. I recognize that the little harness racer is usually the small man in racing, and, frankly I have been interested in trying to help him along, if I could.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, with my Presbyterian up-bringing, I must admit that I have great difficulty in lending myself to doing anything that would greatly increase gambling in this province.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: That is the angle I have pursued.

Mr. Chairman, in the last two years, I have had a great deal to do with the evils of gambling by bookies, in regard to the situation we have in this province. I ask the hon. members of this House to turn to the morning and evening papers of yesterday, or the papers of almost any day or turn to last week's Time, a news weekly, and see what is happening in just one section of the United States, with the Kefaw Committee, with whom we have been working toward the elimination of gambling and vice in this province.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, I have not inmind to do anything which would increase that problem in this province. When you read of Costello and others on the other side of the line, and great gamblingand race-tracks rackets which are run over there, anything we can do as a Legislature of this Province to keep that sort of thing out of here, should be done. That is the attitude I have taken.

I realize that my ffriend the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) is not taking any different point of view to that which I am taking. He does not want to have them here, I am sure. He does not want to have the big-time racketeers

use Ontario for their stamping ground. But the fact is when night racing came on, much of the money came from the other side. My colleagues and myself have been interested in this matter for two or three years back. Big money was offering to come into Ontario to operate night race-tracks on the outskirts of Toronto. Big money has come to operate tracks in the city of Toronto itself. Mr. Chairman, I may come from a small town; I may perhaps not be as sophisticated as they are, but nobody will tell me that big money will come up from Detroit to operate the tracks in Toronto, or that big money will come through New York to o perate big tracks here, because they are interested in the farmers. I do not believe that. I believe they are interested in the tens of millions of dollars the gamblers will get out of this province. My feelings are against it. I do not think it is a good thing for our people. I realize that stand is probably not the most popular one; I realize it may be difficult for some of the smaller operators in this province, but, on the other hand, I believe this, that with four and one-half million people in this province, they still treat morals as being fundamental, and I cannot seeanything for it other than that the introduction of night racing on a big scale is the introduction of a new type of gambling entirely, into this province.

Really, there is very little relation between the system of the pari mutuel tracks and the harness racing tracks. It is different type of racing; a different crown; a different class of people. Actually speaking, I have realized that the ap eal of night racing is to the little men the wage earners, and the appeal is to the small men with a small amount of money, who with his small earnings can go to these tracks

and there engage in a certain amount of betting.

Mr. Chairman, in these days of high cost of living, and in these days when we find it difficult to buy enough meat, enough potatoes, andenough milk to go around, I really doubt if it is a good thing to start up a new type of big-time gambling in this province, which will cost from ten million to twenty million, to forty million dollars a year.

Frankly, I have felt it was wise in this to go slowly, and that is why I have taken the position that if I have to make a mistake, I would rather make a mistake in going too slowly than in going too fast. I really feel that in view of the difficulties we are having with big-time gamblers, I think we should be very careful and go slowly.

In doing that, I realise that you are bound to step on somebody's toes. I agree you will probably step on the toes of the little operators, but I believe that these little operators, the people of Ontario, particularly rural -- no, I should not say that; people of Ontario-- all of the people of Ontario -- would feel we were better going slowly in that, and not lend ourselves to it, because we want to assist some little fellows in Ontario, and by bsing the tools of the big gambling interests from the United States, who have no regard for us, nor for the farmers in this province, nor for the little people of this province. That is our position . I do not think the hon. member for Brandondale (Mr. Walters) takes a different view. I think his view is the same. Our methods are different; that is all.

He said if we want ahead and operated these night tracks and permitted betting there,and so on, it would have

certain advantages. That may be. On the other hand, in weighing all the checks and balances of it, it seems to me we might do profound harm to ourselves and our province in doing that sort of thing, and opening the gates to a completely new type of gambling, which would run into tens of millions of dollars a year.

Mr. Chairman, that is the situation, and I think that answers the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) and I think the question really does not arise from the type of the amendments which we have before us at the present time.

MR. WALTERS: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) I hope will be willing to listen to further information. The point of night racing is this; the one establishment which has built up and has asked for night racing is completely owned right here in the province of Ontario. There is no foreign capital at all. And people who are behind this track--and I know about it -- are very much interested in this form of sport.

I would like to point out to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that the very little man who likes night racing is the man who supports parimutuel racing at Woodbine, Thorncliffe, Fort Erie, Hamilton and the other tracks. He carries a load there too. The figures will prove that. All you have to do is to check the betting which takes place in the ordinary pari mutuel machines, and check the betting which takes place in the club houses, and you will see who it is that does the betting. The 25 cents circle at the Woodbine bets more money than is bet in the clubhouse.

That is the way I feel about it, and this is what bothers me; the little man does not get much of a "break" in this life, particularly in the field of sport. To me it seems that you should do everything in the light of night racing,

because if you do not it seems to me it is a form of discrimination against the people who support the big jockey clubs, who belong to the upper class. The little man carries the load, but the business end of the sport is in the hands of the millionaires.

MR. FROST: I might say to the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) that the question of night racing applies to both of them alike, the thoroughbred and the harness racing.

MR. WALTERS: I think that is one of the troubles; you always have that "lobby" against night racing, and if you will listen to it, you will be in trouble.

MR. FROST: I am always in trouble. That is what I thrive on.

MR. WALTERS: The point I want to make, Mr. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is the little man goes in the afternoon to watch the runners and he bets his $2 or $4 and he lets his day's work go, and he loses a day's pay, as well as gambling the money. If he could go to night races he does not lose his day's work.

MR. FROST: He only loses his money.

MR. WALTERS: All right, but he goes and has an evening of sport and is back on the job the next day. If he is going go gamble, he will gamble. I do not think this government or any other government can eliminate gambling, it is like drinking. The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) gave us quite a lecture on alcoholic education. It is the same with racing. It is part of our system. You have the stock exchange, and you gamble on that, but here is a man who wants to go and bet $2 at a night race-track, and he cannot get

permission to do that. I say that night-racing is better for a man than day racing, because he will not lose his job from laying off, but all he will lose will be his money, and he willlose only with one hand, instead of with both hands.

MR.JS. DEMPSEY (Renfrew South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word on this. I am very firmly in favour of night racing. Ittwill not run late into the night. If you want to go to Thorncliffe track it is lit up, so it looks like the day-time. I think the harness racing has been discriminated against. It is not run by American interests. The track here is not run by the big American interests at all. I cannot understand the opposition to it. I was talking to a man from my county whom I know personally, who said that he did not believe it was any worse for him to go and look at a race at 8 o'clock at night, than to go downtown to a couple of cocktail bars and listen to what is going on there.

AN hon. MEMBER: Close them both up.

MR. DEMPSEY: The place is lighted so it has the appearance of daytime. I am in favour of night racing. May I say that one of the men who sits on the racing Commission is one of the big man in the Woodbine, and he does not want any other racing to interfere with it. Thank you.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Pardon, there is one other thing I want to mention. I know something about racing,you can buy a racing form or a scratch sheet, and get all the "dope" the night before. The little fellow who cannot go to the racetrack -- what does he do? He goes to the "bookie", That man can go to almost any corner and buy a Racing Form or a scratch sheet, ant everybody gets those, If they are able to go to the track, they go and look at the horses, and they put a couple of "bucks"

on a horse, and I do not see that it does any harm.

I think we should cut out all the scratch sheets and the racing forms, and all of it. If you go to harness racing, you do not know what horeses will run, and you get no "dope" of them until you get to the track. Harness racing is the small man's pleasure. Thank you.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear .

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): Mr. Chairman, if we are now ready to come down to a discussion of the Bill, I would like to draw the attention of the House to one of these sections. I have no desire to enter into this general discussion, on night racing. I willleave that to great authority.

But there is one section to which I object.

MR. FROST: Which section is that?

MR. NIXON: Sub-section 3 to sectionll. It gives authority to each member of the Commission to enter into an investigation with all the powers that could be given to him under the Public Enquiries' Act. It does seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that these are very extraordinary powers, which it is suggested to give -- not to the Commission itself -- but to each and every member of that Commission, so that without consulting his colleagues on the Commission , on his own initiative entirely, he can start out on some investigation under the powers which can be conferred by the Public Enquiries' Act, under which was set up the Hope Commission, and he can go on with an enquiry of this kind, the end of which no one knows, with all the powers to summon witnesses and persons, and compel them to produce documents and things, and so on, which he may desire.

I want to register my most emphatic protest against the wide powers which are given to each member of the Commission.

If any such power as that is to be given, then it should be given to the Commission, subject to approval by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

I do submit, Mr. Chairman, that no such additional powers are necessary, over and above those which they now have, under the original Bill which I supported. In that original Bill, under "d" of section 1, which these sections are amending, the Commission has power to do such other things relating to horseracing in all of its forms, and these powers are subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I, for one, am very strongly of the opinion that these powers should be kept subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, if we are going to embark on this wide-spread investigation and enquiry.

(TAKE "D" FOLLOWS)

MR. FROST:: May I ask the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) if that would apply to the power being given to the Commission, or is his objection to the fact that it is to each member of the Commission?

MR. NIXON: My objection is very strongly to each member. I would still say you give all power to the Commission, subject to approval by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. If they want such wide powers ---

MR. FROST: I think the objection is well taken, Mr. Chairman. It is a drastic power. After all, the power is under the other Act.

I would move that sub-section 3 of Section 1 be deleted.

MR. WALTERS: I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should go into a huddle with himself before he strikes that out. A Racing Commission runs into some very unusual situations. It has to have some power.

MR. FROST: I quite agree with that. On the other hand the powers under the Public Inquiries Act are very broad powers. I think they should be exercised only -- provision is in Section 11 now -- with the consent of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I think there is objection to giving the broad powers of the Public Inquiries Act without any reservation at all to the Commission. I think the objection is well founded. I prefer to take it out.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) is absolutely right in principle. I am wondering what led to the proposed amendment. Has the Commission in its first year of operation encountered situations in which it was not feasible or practicable

for the Commission to act as a whole and that they needed this power or thought they needed it?

MR. FROST: That is the point. As I intimated in my remarks a few moments ago, you are dealing in this business with most unusual cases, with most unusual people and with most unusual combinations. That has to be realized. You are dealing with combinations where drugs are given to horses, where horses are substituted, where it is necessary, actually, for instance to tattoo the lips of horses to prevent their interchange with other horses. I admit all of those things. I must say that to give to the Commission the broad powers contained under The Public Inquiries Act is probably too broad, I think we had better try this out for a further year and if it is necessary we can come back with the explanation.

Motion agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

On Section 3.

MR. WALTERS: Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has decided to give all powers of licencing into the hands of the Commission. I think he is probably aware the situation has arisen in New York where the Jockey Club had that power but they had brought a Bill down amending their law to give this power to the Commission because they ran into a terrific law suit, where a character the Jockey Club did not think desirable was put out, off the track. He sued the Jockey Club, the Supreme Court of New York State upheld it. They had to set up a Commission. I do not think it should be in the hands of the Commission. They should control horse racing

all the way through, jockeys, owners and everything connected with it.

Sections 4 and 5 agreed to.

Bill No. 37 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report two Bills, one with amendments.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes. (Mr.Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.8.

THE POWER COMMISSION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 117, "An Act to amend The Power Commission Act", Mr. Challies.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On Section 3.

MR. W. DENNISON (St.David): Mr. Chairman, on Section 3, this Section gives the local Hydro Commissioner power to make the changeover and charge the industrial consumer their portion of it. The other day, when I was speaking on the Throne Speech Debate, the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) seemed to be very perturbed about one of the incidents I read out to the House of certain inefficiencies in the change-over method. Second, I do not know whether he agrees with me that the industrial consumer should pay more. I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) made any investigation of those inefficiencies to which I drew the attention of the House.

Hon. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio):

The incident to which the hon. member for St.David (Mr. Dennison) refers involves staff which were only being trained for that particular work. I would not want to leave the impression that there would be incidents of that kind continuing throughout this momentous programme being carried out. There are so many varied and different types of consumers. I must confess at the same time that on the whole we are getting editorials and comments from the municipalities and Commissions referring to the very excellent results which have been obtained from the process and from the work which is going on. No doubt as this work progresses there will be occasions, human nature being what it is, and because of the difficulty of getting trained engineers to do the work, there will be incidents such as the hon. Member for St.David (Mr. Dennison) mentions. We only hope that as the work progresses there will be better and more trained crews and that the number of incidents will diminish.

MR. DENNISON: I will give the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) an example of what I mean. In the Estimate the total cost of conversion by 1953 would be a cost of $64.28 to change over one consumer. Yet after I spoke the other day the hon. member for York West (Mr.Millard) told me about his own case where he had a refrigerator change-over when he moved into a 60-cycle area. It was changed over. He got a price of $75. from one company which manufactured the refrigerator. The Hydro, however, directed him to another company which indicated a cost of $111. to make the change-over. I am a little worried. If it is a fact there would be 4, 5 or 6 frequency sensitive units in every household and if one refrigerator were to cost

that much we are a long way over our estimate with respect to conversion.

MR. CHALLIES: All I can say is that the hon. member for St.David (Mr.Dennison) must admit that with the increased labour costs naturally there would be an increase with respect to the cost of the unit. You cannot start on ten years' work of that type, a very highly technical programme, without problems. All I can say is that if it ha' been attempted in the leaner years when Hydro was running along at an even crease in tempo of construction we could estimate in a better fash'on. The hon. member for St.David (Mr. Dennison) will acknowledge it when I say conditions now are different than what they were a year ago. What will they be one year from now? I might say, too, that to make estimates with respect to equipment in the home is difficult, because people are still buying. We are trying to keep ahead of that growth. This clause gives the Commission the right to enter into an agreement with a local municipality or a local Commission in order that they may do the work. Clauses 1, 2 and 3 have to do with the work, for the paying of expenses and the charging of a certain type of consumer for that work. We think that is a step by way of advance. There are a number of municipalities which have expressed a desire, even willingness and anxiety, to do their own transforming. The work will be done more efficiently. They know the problems and the place from which complaints are made. They know to where to refer. The work is done much better and much cheaper.

MR. DENNISON: In the changing over they may look after the change-over in the home of the consumers. But, what I am getting at is who will actually do the rewiring on the motors and on the equipment. Would they be able to make use of your Hydro depot at Kipling to do that? What I am getting at, again, is that in this conversion project the greater amount of material we can change over on an assembly line production method with respect to quantity the cheaper the whole conversion will be. If we take one individual refrigerator and send it to one dealer that may be an expensive item.

MR. CHALLIES: Most refrigerator units are sealed units. We arrange with the manufacturers to take them out and put in the unit involved in the change-over. In some cases we try to give a 60-cycle unit so they will still have refrigeration. The manufacturers have given us a very close price on the exchange of the sealed units. The manufacturers have to change them.

MR. HOUCK: Can the hon. Minister (Mr.Challies) tell us how much of the conversion has been completed up to the present time?

MR. CHALLIES: No. I would say in the original estimate of the work which is necessary for the ten year programme, we are keeping ahead of that schedule. The hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) will realize that there has been increase in the demand. Our problem today is not only to keep ahead of our schedule of a year and a half ago but to keep looking after of, taking care of the new energy which is coming in at 60 cycles.

Section 3 agreed to.

On Section 4.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, on Section 4, I believe the practice has been up to now for Hydro, whenever they are able to do so to repay to the province of Ontario advances made by the province to them for their construction work throughout the province. In Sections 4 and 5 they are both required to do this. In Sections 4 and 5 we seem to embark upon a new proposal, a new principle here. From now on all new advances to the Hydro will not necessarily be refunded at all. They may be refunded by agreement between the Hydro and the province but they may not be refunded. The Hydro may keep them. It seems to me if that were to happen we would be in the position of subsidizing the urban consumer of hydro in the same way we now subsidize the rural consumer of Hydro.

MR. CHALLIES: Section 4 provides for the Niagara development in the loan. Section 5 makes provision that the Commission shall pay the principle advanced or they can pay out of reserves principle advanced by the province to the Commission. Section 6 makes provision for the interest. Section 7 provides for any expenses which may be incurred in this transaction. The difficulty is that there is a schedule of the indebtedness owing the province by the Commission. Each loan is outlined. No provision is made for any exchange or advances by the government to the Commission. This is bringing it right into line whereby the province can advance to the Commission money. In all cases there will be loans whatever, as far as the province is concerned. They have to pay the interest and the principle. The fact is that I think you will find

Section 7 says the issue and delivery, province of Ontario bonds and debentures, and so forth, for the same principle amount maturing on the same day or date bearing interest at the same rate or rates, as pa yable. It is stipulated in these two clauses that the principle and interest should be paid by the province.

Sections 4 to 7 agreed to.

On Section 8.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, on Section 8, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr.Challies) to a criticism which was made last year with respect to Hydro borrowing. Apparently we will have to do a great deal more borrowing in the next few years. The province guaranteed $110,000,000. last year. There has been criticism on the part of small bond dealers that those bonds when they are sold are sold to the larger syndicates. In reply to a question of mine last year, from February 15,,1941 to November 1st, 1949, it was stated that $411,000,000. was borrowed. In every case no tenders were called for with respect to the loans and they were taken up by the larger dealers. Negotiations were in the form of private negotiations and the question naturally arises unless competitive bids are asked for we really have no assurance that the Hydro is receiving the best possible interest rate, the best possible return. Smaller bond dealers were in a rather ticklish position; they could not very well undertake this themselves, they had not the finances to undertake the negotiations themselves they had to leave it in the hands of the larger dealers. I am wondering if there is not some way by which the smaller bond dealers

will be able to get in and sell Hydro bonds and that they be made available for purchase by Old Man Ontario, by the smaller investor.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I may tell the hon. member for St.David (Mr.Dennison) that the matter of getting competitive bids with respect to the extent of the borrowings the province and the Hydro have to do is pretty well an impossible one. We have been borrowing in one amount $50,000,000. and $60,000,000. It is quite easy to advertise and perhaps get a tender. After all, those things have to be sold to the public. If you get one of those issues and they go to somebody and the loan goes sour your credit is affected. That is the answer experienced elsewhere. What we have attempted is this: first we take the very best bid we can in the light of the experience across Canada and the experience of the federal government. Our contracts for money have been running to slightly less than the Dominion borrowings and ahead of any of the provinces. Some of the provinces, I see, make statements about their credit;,but the fact is that we have borrowed money and we are continuing to borrow money at rates better than any of the provinces. We approach in most cases the federal borrowings. That is the best test. I do not know of any other system which could be followed. These syndicates which we have handling these matters really are representative of all of the principle bond houses and banks and, to get ahyone which could safely handle the issues of that sort, would be attended by too much risk. That is the best advice we can get from loan advisors, from our financial advisors and from the experience we have had.

March 20th, 1951.

D-10

Sections 8 to 13 agreed to.

Bill No. 117 reported.

(TAKE "E" FOLLOWS)

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.9

DEVELOPMENT OF POWER ON THE NIAGARA RIVER

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 9th Order, House and Committee on Bill No. 118, "An Act to Facilitate the Development of Power on the Niagara River," Mr. Challies.

MR. W. DENNISON (St.David): Mr. Chairman, I suppose by going ahead with this new development now it will be powered by new generators entirely and it will enable us to just simply hold the other ones in reserve or scrap them unless required. We will actually save some of the money we had set aside for conversion of the low generators?

HON. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): I think that is right. I do not know that we will ever reach a stage where there will not be some 25 cycle necessary. 25 cycle electric in certain types of industry where because of the type of 25 cycle motor capacity, 60 cycle being much heavier as a dead weight capacity, that helps in certain industries so that those plants now that are inefficient insofar as utilizing all the water is concerned that I gave the other day where you are getting only 9 hours of slow cubic feet, certainly it stands to reason if you can drop it over and get 30 h.p. for the same amount of water there, it is better. However, there will always be some place, even in a frequency conversion station where we can use it.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, if the Hydro Commission receives approval of both governments to go ahead with the St.Lawrence, you do not intend to go ahead with the second tunnel?

MR. CHALLIES: No, I think that is correct because it is an engineering advantage to have the St. Lawrence come in at the same time where we are developing the other. In other words, it is anticipated this development will be finised in 1954, if you start the St.Lawrence in 1951 it will be through in 1956. You could not get a second tunnel developed through there and get it through by 1956. Where loads are spread it is an advantage, but that would be in reserve.

Sections 1 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 118 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST(Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise and report certain bills, one bill with amednments and three bills without amendments.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex, North): Mr. Speaker, the committee begs to report certain bills, one bill with amendments, and three bills without amendments, and asks leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion Agreed To.

House in Committee, Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Department of Reform Institutions, Page 97, Vote 177.

MISS A. MACPHAIL (York East): Mr. Chairman, I

want to make a few general remarks on the first vote and other things can be discussed under items. The House, I suppose, does know, but perhaps not as well as those of us who follow it carefully the public opinion in the matter of punishment of law breakers, or the treatment of law breakers, has very much changed in the last 20 years, 10 years, particularly in the last five years. It used to be that it did not matter what happened to law breakers, they had done wrong and so you should punish them and the whole thing was to punish them without any real interest on the part of the public in the reformation of the law breakers. There is a great change in that regard. Now, people feel, certainly they break the law and must be punished inasmuch as they are deprived of their liberty and being deprived of their liberty is a real punishment the penalogist and the social workers and everybody who is a student of this matter has come to the conclusion that the time of imprisonment should be used by the government or by whoever is in charge, the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) to do everything they can to help these law breakers not again to break the law and to go out and be good citizens when they are returned to society. There is a growing feeling too that they are not wholly the cause of their trouble, that the homes they come from, the kind of community in which they live, the many, many things, the unsatisfac[illegible] life, they did not stay at school, they stopped at fifth grade, so we say they were not interested in any community enterprise. They had no association with church or boy scouts or girl guides, as the case may be, and I think

all these things play a part. They do not feel themselves a citizen of the community from which they came and worse still, they do not feel themselves as an important member of a family from whence they came. More and more people are coming to think along that line and so they are using the term of imprisonment to try to change the attitude of the law breaker. This is true in the Federal jurisdiction too to an increasing extent and it is very tru in the provincial.

I must say, I cannot help but praise, and I have no wish but to praise this government for what it has done in reform institutions. It started under Mr. Dunbar. It was carried on under Mr. Hamilton and it is going on under the present hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr.Foote). The present hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr.Foote) was himself a prisoner of war for three years and it could not help but give him an insight into the reaction of people deprived of liberty and I think that has been very useful in the short period in which he has been in that position. He has tried in every institution, whether it was men, women, boys or girls, he has tried to speed up this business of reformation rather than just punishment. Of course, there is a punishment and a great punishment by depriving them of their liberty.

The House may know or may not know that the Guelph Reformatory for Men and Young Men, the skim off the cream of the crop, they go to Guelph. I do not intend to go into details, but it is done very carefully by studying each case and finally a panel sits in judgment on them and the men appear before them and what they think are the most

likely to profit by real training are sent to Brampton. The Brampton school for boys, young men, - they are a little older than boys - I think is the very best we have ever had in the province of Ontario. The head of it is a school teacher, the Superintendent Mr. Graham, and really when I visited Brampton I could not help but think that it was a very good trade school, most unlike a prison and very much like a trade school where they are taught many trades and where they are not treated as prisoners. There is a real honour system and Mr. Graham has kept track of what happens. These young men come out and recivitism has been cut, very very greatly, it has been cut more than half. There are very few of them ever come back to any of the institutions.

I think there are two acid tests of any institution, the first one is the spirit that exists between staff and the inmates and the other is the degree of recivitism. When I was first interested in this subject in the Federal field, the thing that first got me interested in it was the terrible degree of recivitism, they just came back and came back and came back. They just went through the business of having a court case and getting them in again and you are almost sure they would come in. The school at Brampton has done a tremendous amount to cut down recivitism and so has done a tremendous amount to save the money of the taxpayers of Ontario. To me the more important thing is it has done a tremendous job to save the lives of the young men involved.

That can be said to a degree of all the institutions in Ontario, but not to such a degree as at Brampton,

I think that is the best. I think Brampton is better probably than the Boys' Reformatory at Bowmanville and what is now to be the Small Boys at Cobourg. I do not think recivitism is as low in either of those. I am not sure of that but the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) can tell us when he speaks. I do not think they do quite so fundamental a job as they do at Brampton.

Then, another great big improvement has been instituted and that is to put some highly trained people on the staff of each institution and then to carry the educational process of the staff by having the staff meetings and conferences and having the staff on the different boys' schools meet together, having leaders in penalogy and sociology and psychology and so on. I think that is all very good and very needed.

Now, I think that is all I want to say at the moment, the rest can be - no, it is not quite all. Segregation should be carried on in all the institutions, but if a real job is to be done on segregation more buildings are needed. There is no way of separating completely what they think are the redeemable from the unredeemable when they are all under one roof. I am thinking for the moment of the Mercer, but you can think of any institution in the same way. You have to have some place where the people in charge think they can be reformed can be kept from mingling daily with those they think are pretty hopeless. Actually, in the Federal prisons there are a great many, but there are far more in the Provincial reformatories, a great percentage of them can be redeemed. We must use scientific methods,

they must be given again faith in themselves. I should like to have some of the officials tell us this, but I believe 90% I should think of all people in all institutions can be redeemed if we use scientific methods. Any other remarks I have to make can wait until we come to the items. I believe in giving praise where praise is due and certainly I am grateful to the government - I am critical of the government in many things, but in this I am not critical, I think they have done a very fine job. I hope the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) does not hear this because he will have to make more speeches on it, but I think a very fine job has been done.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Chairman, does the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) intend to say anything of a general nature before his estimates go any further?

HON. J. W. FOOTE (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to make any extensive remarks, I thought we might deal with the items as they came up, but I would like to thankthe hon. Member for York East (Miss MacPhail) for her very gracious and instructive remarks. I would also like to thank her for the help and co-operation I have received from her since I began this work. As she says, the chief qualifications I had for this job are that I spent three years in jail myself. I was also Chaplain in one of the Military Prisons and I think I have learned that the greatest punishments that can come to anyone is the loss of their liberty and also that a period of imprisonment can be a very

a very constructive period in one's life. I have the benefit of having three of my colleagues who have previously held this office. I do not know whether that is an unmixed blessing or not at times, but at any rate there is always an opportunity to receive advice that has been very helpful. I would refer to the speech made by the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) and I appreciate the comments he has made. I understand the system that we carry on in our accounting is substantially the same as obtained under the jurisdiction of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), but I am sure we both agreed that all things are capable of improvement and we are going into the question that he raised of accounting.

(TAKE "F" FOLLOWS)

I would like to say that the reason for the large number of treasury warrants in this department is that it is very difficult to estimate, I am told, our requirements for industry. The treasury grants which come to us are to provide the raw materials which are manufactured and sold within the departments of the government; so that actually the more warrants we get the more revenue is turned into the government. It does not represent an expenditure in excess of that which has been voted.

During the past year we have had our debits and credits; from one side the picture is not too optimistic; there have been increases in commitments all the way along the line. On the reformatories and industrial farms the increase is 2.32%. The number of committals to jails have gone up 16.11%. The actual sentences are lower than that, being 11.84%. Many of these are for short terms. Long-term prisoners at the reformatory have not shown such a great increase, being 2.32%. Admissions in our training schools have gone up, particularly with the girls. The increase is 12.93% for girls in the past year and 5.69% for boys. The hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) has pointed out the figures for the city have been higher in these institutions than they have been in places like Brampton. I think that the success ratio in the training schools has been around 50%, which is much lower than the Brampton school. I hesitate after just four months in this Department, to draw final conclusions from this increase; but it seems to me that, with our Brampton school, where we have over a four year period a success ratio of 80%, there is some reason for this which might

possibly be applied in educational facilities which are offered through the province. With the training schools you have some sort of training which is comparable, I suppose, to vacational training in some of the smaller schools. We have the success ratio there of about 50%. I think a lot of that could be due to children who are more neglected children rather than delinquent children. Those who are neglected, although they are in the minority, in those schools, I believe, are people who should not be there at all but are there because their own homes have neglected them, or perhaps because the community has not helped as it should. In Brampton where you have 80% success ratio over a four-year period, I think the reasoj for it is that these boys, young men, who have never had any interest in school or in working before, have found out that work is interesting and that with adequate training they would rather work than get into trouble. I have [illegible]me a sheaf of let ers which have come back from those young men who have graduated from Brampton. They tell a very interesting story in their own way. I would like to read one or two of them. I do not want to bear down too heavily on this. They are of a personal nature. In all cases they tell of chaps who have had no stability in the beginn ing, who have come into this school and who have received understanding treatment and were taught a first class trade. They have gone out able to offer something to the community. This man says:

> "I have got a taste of the outside and like it much better than being locked up. I am

working at a certain plant, in the maintenance department and am doing welding. They are paying me .83¢ an hour to start with and I have a chance of good promotion".

He sends his regards to some of us in the Institution. There are similar letters like this. They all tell of men with jobs, and of people who are happy and contented. I believe that the success ratio there points to a weakness in our own schools where you have so many like these chaps who are not suited at all to the avademic programme and who are compelled to stay in school when they have no interest in it, when they get nothing out of it and they are a burden to the teachers. They fall into bad habits. The hope for the future is not very bright with respect to them. If they could have attended a trade school of the same calibre of that in Brampton I do not think they would have gone into our institution there. Another fact is that we have inexpensive buildings. A great many communities feel they cannot have a proper trade school unless they spend a million dollars. That is a great mistake. The virtue of our plan is not in the building but in the advantages and excellence of the training. I should think that the communities which are interested in taking this group who are not interested in academic training, and giving them first class trade training, should give it to them in buildings of moderate price and cheaper construction. This is a bright spot in our work. I hope that it is extended.

At Mimico we are doing something, as I indicated

before, in the way of reformation of alcoholics. One of the hon. members spoke yesterday, I think, in a rather impatient tone about the [illegible] of research. I think I know how he feels. I am rather inclined to be impatient, and get right down to business.

I would like to point out to the hon. member that the man who directs research for our foundation is not a man who is interested just from the academic angle; he has a tremendous moral earnestness about this problem. I know he would not stay in that job very long unless he could see some of his ideas translated into practice. The Mimico Re-establishment School for Alchoholics is one which grew out of this research work and which was offered by our own officials who came forward with this plan and the offer to give extra time to this project. I am hopeful that much good will come out of it. I have been out several times to see it. I would say it is an interesting thing to see the part the inmates have had in helping with this work. There are many of them who are plumbers, bricklayers and so on, who have worked there -- and, youngsters have helped them -- who are not alchoholics but some of whom have had trouble in this way. They all have something rather interesting to say about this project. They are putting their best into it. They all feel that it will be a great thing for people to have this help and not just keep going up a blind alley. Just today I was called out here in the hall, I met a man who wanted to know where he could go to get assistance in respect of this problem. I tell all the hon. members it was a great joy for me to be able to say to him "go to this address, I will telephone

the doctor and he will do what he can for you." A great deal of progress has been made in this connection. I am very hopeful the Mimico centre will be worth a great deal to the men who need it.

In connection with this matter I feel there is a great lack of a similar centre in Institutions to deal with drug addicts. I have in mind a commitment which is just being made today in Ottawa. Again, these are personal things. I do not like to say too much about them in public. We have weekly, people being committed to the Mercer and some of them are drug addicts. I feel it is a shame we have not someplace where they can receive medical attention. I have discussed this subject with the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips). He is very interested in it.. I hope together we may work out something next year in the way of providing adequate medical treatment for those who suffer from the drug addiction, with a corresponding service for them when they leave.

There is one other item which I think will come up later. It is the question of moving the girls from Cobourg to Galt. There has been a good deal of criticism with respect to this move, some of it pretty brisk. The people of Galt do not want to lose the boys. They have taken a great interest in them. We in the Department I think should express our appreciation for what the citizens have done for the boys. Our staff has found a place in the life of the community and proved to be useful citizens. The people of Galt are reluctant to lose them. Nevertheless, we are trying to equalize the opportunities which are offered to boys and girls, men and women in this province.

You must remember that this site at Galt was given by a woman interested in this work with the express proviso that it be used as a training school for girls. It is the only one in Ontario we have for women outside of the Mercer which has the necessary facilities. It is designed so that girls will have private rooms. The grounds are large and sufficiently isolated from the community so that they will avoid many of the difficulties we meet at the present time in Cobourg. The Cobourg school, you know, consists of two old houses. We have added a third one now which will give us room for the larger population from Galt. They have a dormitory system which we think will be suitable for the young boys. We have about 20 acres of ground which should be sufficient. The buildings are in the town and provide a good deal of difficulty in the handling of the girls. They do not present that same difficulty with respect to the boys. At any rate, we are trying to equalize the opportunities we have to offer. We have for the boys a splendid school at Bowmanville. We have these three houses at Cobourg. Whether or not the move is popular it was a right thing to move these girls back to the school which was built for them and to give them every opportunity for training and for successful rehabilitation.

I think the remainder of my comments might be made as we deal with the various items. The costs are up somewhat, partly because of the increased population, partly because of the increased cost of living, materials and so on. There is also some provision for some of the plans about which I have been talking. I do not think the hon.

members of this House would even begrudge an addition treasury warrant if they were to find that there were plans afoot within the scope I have mentioned. However, I think they are provided for. I would just like to say at the end of the remarks I have made that I have appreciated very much the splendid help, co-operation and loyalty of my staff. My Deputy Minister is a senior Minister in the service of the government. I think it must have been a great thrill for him to have seen the gradual development and improvement in this service which has occurred. It is due to him and to his staff as well as to the supervision of the various Ministers that this department has reached the status it now holds and which, indeed, is being copied by some of the provinces of Canada.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am sure the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) is to be thank for what he said. It behooves one to say that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr.Foote) always tried to be helpful. He answered several of my questions and some of which I did not even think. There are three general questions I wish he would later on take up. First of all, with respect to staff, I want to know what obstacles still stand in the way of getting an increase in pay for your guard staff, your attendants or orderlies, because I want to know what we can do to help you overcome those obstacles. First of all, it puts a very harmful pressure on the staff. The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr.Foote) knows what I have in mind. There is also the danger from break-outs.

Secondly, I would like to be assured that the inmates now have a sufficiently clear idea of where they stand in regard to remission and parole. The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr.Foote) will remember how great a part ignorance on that subject played in connection with the Burwash riot. The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr.Foote) will remember from his own personal experience how a man in jail broods on any scrap of information he can get. It is extremely important that inmates get the full and correct story with respect to where they stand with regard to parole.

Would the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr.Foote) be good enough to enlarge on that, give us that assurance, if he can give it. If he cannot give it, let him give it his attention.

Thirdly, to what extent are you now drawing on the experience of the federal people, who are certainly trying to be scientific in their penalogy.

MR. FOOTE: First of all, with regard to pay, the pay of the guards is under consideration by the Civil Service Commission. They are waiting for a report. The guards in the service of Ontario are not paid as much as those in the federal service...The starting salary is $1,880. including cost of living bonus. I would think the federal would run about $150. more. In respect of that study which is taking place now, we are waiting for a recommendation which would bring that, I would think, pretty well into line. There is a great difference in the conditions under which they work. For instance, in Burwash, we have a retail store where the members of the

staff can buy their supplies at very little more than cost, that is, at 5% over cost. We have a dairy herd there and milk is produced and sold at 6½¢ a quart. Most of the costs are in line with that. The average rent, I think, is about $12.50. Some of the places are $17.50 and there are some around $20. The guards begin at $1,800. at Burwash, plus a very low living cost.

(TAKE "G" FOLLOWS)

And again in those respects I might not be concerned so much with the initial salary as with the flexibility that we could have to raise the salaries should these people show an aptitude for the job. We have guards and corporals, sergeants, lieutenants, captains, assistant superintendents; and so, through the various institutions, there is room for promotion and a guard who goes in and works and has any ability is likely to get along very well in that service. But I believe that we will be able through the years to improve somewhat on the starting salaries.

It has been pointed out that the guards in our institutions have not the same custodial risks as those in the penitentiaries. However, our institutions are not walled, there is not the same reluctance to let the prisoners move about and that does entail a good deal more responsibility. I have a feeling that if we can get the inmates convinced of this fact, that the fewer guards, the better, and the more money we will have to spend on constructive features in the prisons, that that is part of the solution. For instance: down at the Mercer there are three guards who are kept there just in case of trouble, in case of a break-out. Their salaries amount to a good deal during the year and I am naive enough and trusting enough to believe that if you can talk to those girls when they come in and explain to them that if they behave themselves and do not need the guards, we can use this money for courses of education and training, improvement of quarters and all the rest of it, that they would react favorably. I believe the emphasis should be more and more on the

constructive features that are offered. We need psychiatrists and psychologists, men to work in the trade schools and all this kind of thing and I believe that the fewer guards you need to have, the better. I would rather we would have a few escapes during the year and offer a little more freedom to the inmates.

We have a good deal to do with the Federal authorities and expect to have a meeting shortly where joint experiences and new ideas and that sort of thing will be discussed. Alex Edmison is one of the heads of the John Howard Society and works closely with us in that field.

With respect to the Parole Board, I have a note to say that the decision of the Parole Board is given in writing to the prisoner on the same day as the hearing but I believe also that, when a man is committed, he understands that for his definite sentence there is no question of parole at all, that that may come up after that, after the definite sentence is served, with regard to the indefinite part of the sentence. I know we have a good many requests for parole and on our records we can see at a glance the earliest possible date for parole. I will find out whether that information is given to the prisoner and I suppose it might well be done.

On the parole records that I have here, I see that there are listed 9.3% failures with regard to the men and 18.18% for the women, so it is rather a good picture of the success of the parole system. I believe that one of the angles that we should explore is trying to make this a more helpful and efficient system for

the inmates as they are paroled and we are doing something along that line.

Does that cover the question?

MISS MacPHAIL: I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) about the Parole Board. Is it true that only the Chairman receives a salary, or do they all get per diem or travelling expenses, or what?

MR. FOOTE: The Chairman gets a salary and one of the women on the Board, the permanent Secretary, gets a salary. The rest are paid per diem rates: $25. a day when they go to Burwash and $15. when they attend anywhere else. Plus expenses.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) whether he would care to enlarge at this time on a matter of general importance before we begin dealing with the itemized sections. Some while ago either the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) or his predecessor (Mr. Hamilton) made a pronouncement which I believe met with general approval from the public. I know that I, for one, welcomed it and was looking forward to its implementation.

I am referring to the announcement that the Department was considering allowing certain prisoners who have been convicted of minor offences to work during the day and serve their sentences during the nights. In other words, not cause them to lose their jobs or lose the income while they serve the minor sentence. Now, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that that is a very worthwhile consideration. We have all had experiences with people who commit very minor offences. I am

sure every hon. member of the House has had wives coming to ask him to do something about husbands who may have been found drunk during the week-end, were given seven days, ten days or two weeks. They lose jobs very often. Certainly the family is deprived of the income. It would be sufficient punishment, so it would appear, if such a man were deprived of a great many of his freedoms, if he would have to report in the evening and stay in the institution until the next morning when he goes to work.

MR. H.C. NIXON (Brant): Maybe he would rather have it the other way around.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, he perhaps would want to have it the other way around as the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) suggests but I think there is merit to the suggestion, to the idea. If I am not mistaken, it has been tried elsewhere and found quite a successful method. I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) would care to enlarge on it at this moment.

MR. FOOTE: Mr. Chairman, I think there is a good deal of merit in that suggestion and I believe that the former hon. Minister (Mr. Hamilton) said something about it. I think that I heard about it myself through the press. It has possibilities and it has difficulties. I would like to discuss it with the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) because it would have to be decided what constitutes a minor offence. We have got to draw the line somewhere. I can see the possibility of a great many people claiming that theirs is a minor offence when actually it is not. When you speak of

drunkenness, I suppose that certain acts performed at that time were not of consequence and it seems foolish for the family to live in poverty.

I have had cases where they can't get anywhere with a municipality, because the situation lasts only a short time and it may mean that their family is in great need. It certainly does a man no good to stay a month in jail as far as reform - it would be better if he could get out and go to his work. However, there is the problem what would happen if a man goes out to work, gets drunk again and does not come back. And there is the nailing down of the minor and the major offences.

However, I agree that there is something in this suggestion and I would like to discuss it with the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) before I would make any announcement on what we would recommend.

MR. G.E. PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote). It could come up under different items, I guess; it reappears in several items so it might just as well be brought forward under this general heading.

I notice that within the Estimates for the Department in the various reformatories, there is a total amount of money, running into about $2,000,000. for the purpose of "materials, machinery", etc., etc., in connection with industrial operations in the reformatories. The question I was wanting to direct to the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) is with respect to the nature of the industrial undertakings in the reformatories, the degree, or do they enter the market and, if so, how do

they enter the general market or what is the use that is put to the products, generally?

We know about the license plates and things like that; to what extent are there other things coming through our prison work shops and finding their way -- are they finding their way into the general market or where are they used?

MR. FOOTE: There is no general sale of any of the manufactured products. They are all used within government institutions. In Guelph, as you may see as we go through, I think the estimated revenue from Guelph - which is the biggest - is around $1,700,000. whereas the total cost of the operation of the place is something around a million more than that, about $2,700,000. If any of the hon. members would like to visit Guelph and see the plant for themselves, they would be welcome and I would be glad to arrange it. We have a very wide range of industries there. For instance, there is the abbatoir which supplies the cured meats for all the reform institutions in the Province and some of the fresh meat which is sent in the refrigerated cars to the various institutions. That in itself is a very big business. There is a woollen mill there where yarn is manufactured and they make blankets for all the institutions and overcoating materials for the inmates, socks and all types of woollen goods. There is a woodworking shop where we make all the furniture, such as dining room tables and chairs, desks and so on, for Mercer and the Bowmanville place - all of them - quite a considerable

enterprise. I think that the furniture in my office was made in Guelph by the inmates.

The idea of having industries there is not primarily to save money but we must do something with them when they are finished. In the woollen mill alone, the man who is the foreman has told me that the boys who make a success of this trade, which includes not only the running of the machines but the repair and so on, have gone out into civilian life again and have made more money to begin with than he gets for teaching them. But they do supply a great deal of material to the institutions, although the chief purpose is the training of the men. And the same applies to the woodworking business and plumbing and all that. Take, for instance, the plumbing shop which produces no income but which gives a training which is really good. They have an order given to them for a certain plumbing job and they have to draw a plan of it and calculate their requirements, estimate a cost and then set up the whole thing. Some of these jobs are so complex that they constitute a parallel with a plumbing job in an apartment building so that, when a man gets out, he has been given every problem that he can meet. There is no money in that type of industry at all but the products of the other industries are used in the institutions.

With respect to the farms, the livestock valuation at Guelph is, I think, about $30,000. and, if I remember correctly, our income from milk products there is about $28,000. a year. They have the world's champion cow there and the North American champion at Mimico.

The livestock from those cattle are sold at pretty high prices - I think we got $1,500. for one of the bull calves there a short time ago.

On the other hand, you go up to a place like Monteith where we have a herd we are building up to the same state of excellence, if we can, and whether it is good bookkeeping or good business, I do not know, but we sell these pedigreed cattle there to the farmers who are trying to get along for a flat rate of $25. apiece for the young stock in an effort to build up the quality of the stock there and help those people who are farming in pioneer districts.

So, all the way around, it is not a competitive feature. You could get out of the income altogether, as far as that goes, and buy everything outside but you would be getting out of the most instructive element of the whole work, which is training people to make useful citizens.

MR. PARK: I have no criticism to make at all about training prisoners in the use of tools and so on. My only point was, I was interested to learn what use was made of the finished products. Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) tell us whether there is any pay allowance or anything made in that regard to those involved and whether anything is available to the families of the people? I think he appreciates that frequently the victims of these situations are the families themselves and I wonder if he could tell us whether there is any possibility, or thought being given to the development, of such a program?

MR. FOOTE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have thought a

good deal about that. In the States there is, not an actual salary paid but a sort of gratuity which runs from the lowest figure, which, I think, is 25 cents a day, up to around 65 cents, which is given to prisoners who are employed in certain industries where that amount can be charged against the industry. For instance, at Guelph we make license markers for motor cars and the amount charged to the Department of Highways is not very big, as far as profit goes - a profit of $15,000. last year - so that you could quite easily increase that to a more comparable figure of what you would pay outside and be in a position to decide whether you could pay those people something for the work that they do.

In the States, in some of the places where they pay 25 cents a day, it does not really amount to very much because they charge up against the inmate many of the things that we give them free. If a man is incarcerated for two years, I believe the maximum is $20 - $10. a year, which is very little. And the way things are today, if a man is discharged from Burwash after two years, he comes down here with $20. in his pocket and he comes to the Parole Board and sees about getting a job. If the money is used up, he can draw, from the Parole Board offices, money or have it arranged that it be paid for his lodgings and he is given meal tickets or enough for his food.

However, it seems to me that if a man is engaged on anything that we can properly claim some revenue from, that it is worthwhile considering whether or not we could build up some gratuity for him that would be

of more importance. I had a chap the other day who came down with his $20. and he had "blown" it in and he had come for some assistance. I found from the Parole Board that a job had been found for him when he got there, when he landed the first day, and I said to him: "Why didn't you take it?" "Well," he said, "You have never been in jail, you don't know what it's like, being two years up there, and you get outside and everything is different and," he said, "I just couldn't get myself adjusted to take that job and get down to work." I know how he would feel about it - it is quite true.

Of course, the government is not very apt to provide money for people to take a holiday after they have been at Burwash but there is the difficulty, from the humanitarian point of view, of getting that fellow re-established and I think if we could give him a gratuity which could be paid to him progressively, it would give a fellow time to get his hearings and choose a type of work that is more than a stop-gap for him and it might even help him to set up in a small way for himself. It would be very small, I know, but we are thinking about those things and I would be glad, indeed, to have your comments on the plan.

MISS MacPHAIL: Yes, but, Mr. Chairman, there would be other inmates employed at maintenance work and such like and it would not be fair to just pay some little bit to the people who make the license plates and then the others who are probably working as hard and it might be harder not getting anything.

Would you not have to cover the whole field or none?

Would you not have trouble within the institutions?

(TAKE "H" FOLLOWS"

I was thinking of the shop industries, and of the production, from which you can claim something. I would say that I think it would be appreciated by those who are interested in factory conditions that a man who works eight hours a day in a plant where we are making the markers, is under a great deal more stress, than a man working on the farm or grounds.

You know, I am always open to suggestions.

MISS MACPHAIL: The Federal Government, I understand pays a small amount. I do not know whether it is over the whole field, or just to special groups.

MR. FOOTE: I do not know, but I was under the impression that they have a number of them.

MISS MACPHAIL: I think a little bit goes to everybody.

Before we leave this vote, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) tell us how far they have gone in rehabilitation, and where he thinks the rehabilitation officers should be attached. My impression is that not very much has been done, and I think it is important.

MR. FOOTE: Well, in the boys and girls institutions, there is a great deal of it done. We have 9 rehabilitations officers for the Training Schools.

MISS MACPHAIL: They are attached to the schools?

MR. FOOTE: Yes. Before the war, and during it, we had just two officers; at the present time, we have 9, and I have a request for two more and the reason this end of the work is building up is that the rehabilitation officers spend a considerable time in the schools getting to know the boys and girls, and

when they go out to work, there are certain visits paid to them, and there is always the liaison between the placement officer in the community and the Ministers of the various churches, to whom the officer writes, asking them to visit the boys or girls. I would say for these training schools that the field is adequately covered.

In the more adult cases, as you will see when we get to the estimates of the Parole Board, the ratio is not too bad. We have more difficulty with the women. I do not mean that as a flippant remark. We need to train these girls to do jobs for which there is some demand. At the present time they are trained in the tailor shop or the laundry, and perhaps neither of those is suitable at all to the temperament of the girls, and certainly in a steam laundry, it is not very attractive. We are trying to find out what type of work employers need, and train the girls to do it. I do not say there is not a great deal more we can do in this regard. We have an officer in the Mimico School, a man who has had a very successful experience with the D.V.A., and I think we will have another one there before long. But it is a specialized job. You have to have a man who knows the employers and the industries, and who can follow these people up. It seems to me this rehabilitation, in order to be successful, must include doing something to get him a job, and getting him started. If he goes back to his old ways, it is really more than the rehabilitation officer can handle. There is one at Guelph, one at Brampton, one at Toronto, and one at Mimico.

MISS MACPHAIL: I would judge we have nothing like enough for the adult group. How many are they in the Mercer? Are there any there?

MR. FOOTE: There is one. I do not know as much about the Mercer as I should like, but I am learning.

MISS MACPHAIL: The one that is there is the one attached to the Parole Board?

MR. FOOTE: Yes.

MISS MACPHAIL: I do not think that is anything like enough. One person cannot get to know the inmates and know the filds where they possibly could get employment. It is altogether too big for one.

MR. MILLARD: I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote), on item 5 of Vote 177, where there is another item "Prisoner Rehabilitation Grants and Expenses", and it seems to me a very small amount. I would like to know what that covers, because I am also interested in the question raised by the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail) with regard to rehabilitation as a program in our reform institutions. Then, while the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) is answering that question, I would like him to tell us what his view on the question of cost of living bonus for the entire department? I noticed when he was speaking about the officers in the Department of Reform Institutions, they start at $1880., including the cost of living bonus.

MR. FOOTE: Yes.

MR. MILLARD: It seems to me that you have put your finger on the problem. Every time you figure the income of an officer, or a member of the staff, you automatically include the cost of living bonus, and it

seems to me the cost of living bonus should be included permanently as part of the salary structure and stop this business of always adding it as an extra. In the first place, it means that the salary looks bad without the cost of living bonus. The other thing I would like to enquire further about the kind of materials produced in these various institutions. I want to commend the Department, and both the hon. previous Minister (Mr. Hamilton) and the present hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) for the splendid work which is being done in the Mimico Institution. I know that comes up in a later vote. I particularly want to compliment Major Wright for the splendid program which wnet on when he was there. I want to suggest to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) that should be extended. It seems to me we have had almost a permanent shortage of cement, and it seems to me there was no reason, if we can produce a No. 1 brick, and a No. 1 building tile, while we cannot produce a No. 1 cement for use on government projects, and that might supply part of the answer to the problem that seems to be facing us in connection with government schools, the Workmen's Compensation Building, the Hydro project, and others. If the present manufacturers of cement cannot fill the needs, -- and there is, as I have said before, almost a perpetual shortage -- this is one of the things which might be done.

I am also interested in the question raised by the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) with respect to remuneration for these people, and particularly for their families, who have rehabilitation allowances. If the inmates participate in the enterprises within the

institutions, when they leave, they have with them one great asset, in that they have learned new skills, and learned new trades. I know that Major Wright told the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail) and myself, when we wnet ofer the Mimico Insitution a year ago, that one of the brick manufacturers had left a standing order for any man who was qualified in that line of work, would be employed by him, and the job carries very high pay. It is a skilled job. It seems to me that a lot of these people who run foul of the law, and finds themselves in these institutions, ought to utilize their time for rehabilitation while they are there, so they can go out and carry the load of supporting their families in a much better way. The families, as the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) said is very often the victim in these cases, and by learning these skills, a man can better provide for them upon his release. I believe that many times people are there in a spirit of frustration, by not being able to do the thing they would like to do. But when they learn new skills, and produce something useful in the interest of the people of this province, it seems to me there should be some effort made to assist them in the rehabilitation, following their releases.

I would like the comments of the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) on that particular idea.

MR FOOTE: I believe there has been a reluctance to carry this through to a point where they would compete with industry, but after all, if the materials are to be used for government buildings, the same principle should apply to cement, brick and tile. We will look

into that, and I will be glad to talk it over with the hon. member (Mr. Millard).

I had given some thought to the payments of gratuities, taking into consideration what has been done in other jurisdictions. Also the capital cost of maintaining a prisoner in the institution. We hope to arrive at something useful.

With regard to the cost of living bonus, I am thinking of the total amount of money -- and, by the way if it is taken off, it does make the salaries look very low indeed.

I have been thinking of the possibility in the institutions of using our own materials to provide the housing for our own employees, which would help them a great deal. Where we have our own farms, it would be ideal . It has been suggested -- that possibly something could be arranged whereby they could have their salaries raised, and get their own homes. This item No. 5 has nothing to do with the salaries one grant made, for instance, to the John Howard Association is $2500. Originally, some years ago, the grant to the John Howard Association was $5,000. In the time of depression, it was cut out altogether, and later restored at $2500. I think this year we will pay enough to bring it up to around $4,000., and I hope we can squeeze $5,000 a year, for the work they are doing for the people of Ontario, and I hope in time it may be extended.

(TAKE "I" FOLLOWS)

Also, there is provided there small amounts which a man may get if he needs assistance. What happens there is that we find that some people who come constantly to this fund just make a circuit of the Parole Board and the Salvation Army and the John Howard Association and get small amounts. There is no objection to that, no objection to them getting a bite to eat but it is a discouraging thing that they have not settled down to a regular job.

Vote 177 agreed to.

On Vote 178.

MISS MACPHAIL: I would like to know about the Parole Board, who applies it and how they decide and for how long is it appointed? I understood that only the Chairman received a salary but $25.00 a day is not a bad salary, they are going pretty steadily. I would like to know more about the Parole Board, how it is appointed.

MR. FOOTE: Well, I do not know much about it myself to tell you the truth. It is one of the activities of the Department that I have hesitated to get into very much because I had a few other projects that I wanted to do something with. The Parole Board consist of these officials, a Chairman and Chief Parole Officer at $4,000 a year; the Secretary gets $3,450 and four assistant Parole officers who are paid from $2740. down to $2540, those are the permanent officials. The members of the Board consists of the Chairman, who is the same as the Chief Parole Officer, he gets no salary and Colonel Button, of the Salvation Army, Mr. Maxwell, Mr. G.S. Gordon, and Miss Melrose is a member of the Board but

she is also an assistant Parole officer.

MISS MACPHAIL: A rehabilitation Officer, is she?

MR. FOOTE: Yes, she is the one who does it for the Mercer. Each member of the Board receives expenses plus $25. a day allowance for each meeting at Burwash and $15, a day for other institutions. This is in keeping with the fees paid by the Federal Government. The number of prisoners receiving indefinite sentences and transferred to reformatories and industrial farms was 1,578, those are the indefinite ones to be considered. There were 70 meetings of the Parole Board so the fees would be 70 times $15., it does not amount to really very much. There were 676 paroles authorized, that is 42% of the number which came before the Board. It makes quite a bit of work, 676 cases and 70 meetings. There were 536 men paroled and 44 women and the failures, as I have said before, are 50 men, which is 9.3% and 18.1/8% for women. I think you might agree with me that some of those failures are more attributable to us than to the women in that our appropriation in the way of training is not up the standard of men.

MISS MACPHAIL: Probably the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) could tell me this, does the Parole Board carry over from one government to a government of a different confection? I am trying to find out if these Parole Boards go on forever or when do they stop them and what stops them?

MR. FOOTE: I am sure if the hon. member's (Miss MacPhail) party ever gets in they are free to do whatever they wish in this connection and I have no doubt they would do so. I think the policy of the

present government is not to disturb anybody at all who is doing a good job.

MISS MACPHAIL: What I meant is how do you get those Parole Officers stopped if you think there is one of them who is inefficient, how do you get rid of them or how do you add to them?

MR. FOOTE: If you know how, you tell me.

MR. FROST: They are appointed by Order-in-Council and they are rescinded.

Votes 178 to 181 inclusive agreed to.

On Vote 182.

MISS MACPHAIL: We cannot pass over the Mercer as easily as all that. I think the most neglected institution up until the present hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) came in some months ago was the Mercer. I agree that there has not been as much training to fit them for jobs which they can get and do when they get out as there has been in other institutions. I have visited the Mercer on many occasions, trying to find out what I thought was the matter and it was very difficult. First it was run along a military line, like a military establishment, and you could not get anybody to talk. I even took down the best looking man in our group --

MR. PORTER: Who is that?

MISS MACPHAIL: I will not say who it was, the rest of you would be mad but I could not get any girl or woman to talk freely. I tried very hard and they just would not say anything, I mean the inmates, you just could not get anywhere, they seemed to be terrified to say a word. I decided there was something desperately wrong with the Mercer. I had a talk with Alex Edmison, K.C.

on it and he agreed there was something wrong with it but he did not know what was wrong. Well, the present hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) has started to improve it and I am very grateful.

What was the matter, I think, the discipline was too stiff altogether. I mean, somebody went ahead of you with a bundh of keys jangling and every door was locked after you wnet through and unlocked to let you through and such locking and unlocking of doors I have never seen before. The thing was carried to a great extreme in my opinion and the women were all in cells. Well, in my opinion, there is no need of having cells in a womens' institution. There is grating on the doors. One thing that was all right was the dining room and it was clean. The whole building was always spotlessly clean, I can say that for the Mercer. However, there was no freedom of association, the women were desperately unhappy in the Mercer. The corridors outside the cells were the barest looking places I have ever seen. There were two or three stiff back chairs, not many of them could sit down at once because there was nothing to sit on, it was without doubt as bad as anything I have ever seen, well, except the Don Jail. They do have stoves in the Mercer, in the Don Jail they just have vats with fire underneath them. Inmates have stew and rice, there is nothing else, because there is no way of cooking it. At the Mercer the food was good and they sat down in the Dining room to eat but past that I really could not give any praise of the Mercer. It was very, very bad.

Well, this year due to the good offices of the

present hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) I had the opportunity to go down to West Virginia to visit what is supposed to be the best womens' reformatory in the United States and the difference was just like the difference between night and day, night being the Mercer and day the West Virginia. It is at a little place called Alderston, just a little town. It was something penalogists would dream about but would not very often see. They call it "The Reserve", 500 acres and there are two campuses. It looked very much like a University. It is a mountainous country. Actually there were eight buildings for inmates and one for staff and then there was on the lower campus I think that was the place, where one of the great educational institutions were and in the upper campus that was repeated again making sixteen, what they call cottages for inmates but each cottage had thirty people in it, so it was quite a large building. And then separated from the buildings by some hills in a valley they had good farming land supporting a very large dairy herd and a very large piggery. What amused me the most, was that the women in charge of the pigs, I think there were 500 pigs, were all citizens of New York City, everyone of them and they were there because they wanted to be there, that is what they chose to do. I suppose they do not have pigs in New York City and it was a novelty. The women took care of the dairy, they had a herdsman to do the feeding but women took care of the dairy herd milking and taking care of the milk, and they had cottages over on the farm separated from the campus.

I want to read to the House what they did, by

way of educating and interesting and instructing these women. First, there were no cells, there were no bars on the windows except in the reception center when they came in from the jails, at no other place was there a cell, no other place was there a bar, not one. The only indication that it was a reformatory were two men in uniform at the gate. The women were locked into their rooms at night and in no other way could you tell it was a reformatory. The variety of work was very much like we have for men at Guelph. There were many industries and in each of these cottages were thirty people with a house mother -- they did not use that term, they used some other term that we do not use at all, it was not a bit like "matron" but they had a matron in charge of each cottage and each cottage consisted of the bedrooms and a good living-room, just like in a home and a dining room, and kitchen. They did their own work, they did their own cooking, and so on, and the dining room and everything was clean, the people moved about much as they would move about anywhere. They did not wear uniforms, the people who did the cooking wore white in all the cottages but others wore colours or figured dresses or whatever they liked and when you arrived out in the campus you had no feeling that these were prisoners.

(TAKE "J" FOLLOWS)

The factories were working eight hours, the same as the situation which obtains here. What they made would be used inter-departmentally, as it is here. That is, they made a great many things but they were just used by the other government departments. The thing which was extraordinary about their work was weaving. I have never seen anywhere else such glorious weaving. In all the cottages, the cottages of the inmates and the cottages of the staff, the drapes and bedspreads, etc., were hand woven. Everything which could be made by hand was made in that way. It was really beautiful work. One would seldom see as fine weaving.

As I moved around the women would talk very freely. One would really have conversations. One woman said "I just love weaving. I stay in this weaving industry all day, I have a small loom in my room and if I am not going out to lectures or some other thing on the campus at night I weave for recreation." The weaving industry had done something for that woman which nothing else would do. She loved to weave, so she would always make a hobby of it even after she left that Institution and would probably make a living from it. I want to tell you all they did. These are the classes. In Home Economics they taught cooking, sewing, home nursing, child care, table service, personal appearance, laundry theory -- and I do not know what that is -- and household management. In Handicrafts they taught knitting, weaving, needlecraft, pottery, woodcraft, leathercraft, silvercraft, belt making, metalcraft, woodchipping and plastics.

Surely among all those there would be something every inmate would want to do. Academically they taught English, spelling, penmanship, arithmetic, algebra, spanish, world history, American history and physiology. In music they taught piano, music appreciation, voice, orchestra, chorus. In office training they taught typing,

filing, shorthand, bookkeeping and secretarial science. In discussion groups they had current events, family relationship, religious education and interpretive reading. In health instruction they had pre-natal instruction and a hospital attendant course. They also had gymnasium and beauty culture.

You see, what has been the matter in Ontario Institutions for women is that nothing was done women want to do. I am not blaming anybody, neither the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote), nor the Deputy Minister of Reform Institutions, nor the Director, or any Official, but the thing is that instead of the Mercer being different from the men's institutions it was the same. The women were not interested in the kind of sports which were offered. They were not interested in the kind of work offered. They were not interested in the kind of recreation offered. Of course they were frustrated and mad. They rioted for fun. They had to do something.

The programme carried on in West Virginia was very comprehensive. Last Fall they put on a great Fair, as they called it; call it any name you like; but they took the United Nations as their theme. It was beautifully done. They had figures which made it very clear. They made figures and dressed them in the costumes of all the Nations. All these figures were on the platform. The Fair part of it was an exhibition of the work which was done in the Institution. They thought it was not fair to leave the dairy people out of the Fair; they brought in a calf. It broke out two or three times. That was the only difficulty they had. They rescued it always. I do not know whether or not they brought one of the hogs. They really had a Fair just like one to which we would go. For three days the public came, hundreds, thousands of people. When they finished not one inmate and not one piece of property had

disappeared. That shows, I think, that reform works. They have an honour system. They told me they had not had an attempted escape for one year. They said the repeaters were of two types, namely, the people who wrote cheques and the drug addicts. They had a high percentage of repeaters of those two types of inmates. Not in the others, however; they have cut down very much among the other types. Of course, the drug addicts are the victims of the longing for drugs which they are not able to overcome. Apparently people who write cheques find it a much easier way of getting money than any other way which they can think, so they keep right on writing bad cheques. I feel that if we could do something like that here our troubles with Mercer would pretty well disappear, added to the fact that we need a good rehabilitation system, not just one officer but several who will get to know the women and who will find some job outside they are capable of doing, and who will keep in touch with them. The trouble is, whether it be men, women, boys or girls, they go back to their friends, to the people they know. The people they know are the wrong people. I think we have to find friends for them and surroundings for them which are much healthier from a moral point of view than those they had before entering the Institutions.

I do not wish to keep the House any longer telling the hon. members about the programme in Virginia but if any of the hon. members are ever down there, do get a letter from the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) in order that you can go through and see what I saw. On this whole continent you will not see anything finer than the Women's Reformatory at Alderston. Of course, it is a federal reformatory with a tremendous amount of money spent on it, and spent in the days when a dollar was worth one hundred cents and when building costs were very much lower than they are today. I doubt even if the Federal Treasury of the United States would undertake

March 20, 1911

the campus as we saw it. They call it the reservation, the whole 500 acres. It must have cost a vast amount. Today it would be an unthinkable expenditure. However, much can be done even in poor buildings.

The acid test which I mentioned earlier was that the spirit there between the staff and the inmates was so delightful one could hardly tell which was which, had it not been for the distinction in clothing. There was such a feeling of real comradeship and friendship. I drove all over the place with Miss Jones, the Deputy Warden. She knew every person we passed by name. That was amazing to me because I am not very good on names. She would call out to them as we drove along, stop the car and ask how this and that was. There was a real feeling of trust and comradeship. That, I think, has to be developed if we are going to reform anybody. If we do not do that we are just wasting the taxpayers' money as well as our time.

Section 182 agreed to.

MR. FOOTE: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) and I agree on what we wish to do with the Mercer Reformatory for the girls. I was just thinking that I should at this point, say that Miss Millen, who has been the superintendent there for a good many years, has retired. It is fitting that we should say something in appreciation of her work there throughout all these years. I am sure there were difficult times for superintendents in charge of Institutions in the days of the depression. Doubtless many of the things they would have liked to have done they were not able to do because of the lack of funds. I do think the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) will admit that a great deal was accomplished there under the superintendency of Miss Millen. We have appointed now Mrs. Burroughs, who was Assistant Superintendent, as Superintendent. I did not tell anybody about the Virginia trip, but

now that it is out I am sure all hon. members would be very much in favour of it. In the Mercer seventy percent. of the girls take part in activities outside the day's work. In the daytime academic work, in which the public school curriculum is followed, is carried on the schools. Business courses, also, are given. There are classes in beauty culture, with good equipment and good instructors. There is a gymnasium, regular classes in physical training and games. There is a library, a first-class one, which is under the direction of The Toronto Library. All in all, Miss Millen has accomplished a great deal there, which we appreciate, and we would like to go on from there.

The Mercer Reformatory doubtless has many advantages due to the fact of it being in Toronto, because we are in a position to get part-time instructors in music, drama, arts and crafts, which would be impossible if we were outside of the city. There is a considerable amount of outside activity also. We are making the best of what we have. I think we can do a great deal for the girls.

MR. W.H. TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Chairman, before we leave Item 182, I think I should say I do not know whether it would come in under Item 3 or 4, but I wonder if the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) would explain how purchases of supplies for the Mercer, and perhaps other Institutions, are carried out. I am informed that the purchases of textiles are almost entirely confined to one Institution or one wholesaler in Toronto and that many other firms which are equally well able to supply the goods, are unable to get any business from the department. Do you purchase textiles by tender or is it done by a single purchasing agent?

MR. FOOTE: I will give you the details if you like. My impression is that they are buying textiles not in Toronto at all, but from the mill at Prescott, where they have produced goods for us which are cheaper and of better quality as compared with those we

are able to get elsewhere. I believe they did buy them from England at one time. I think I had a visit from a man who voiced the same objection, after he had been to see you too.

MR. PORTER: As a last resort.

MR. FOOTE: He came to see me. I will give you the information you want.

MR. TEMPLE: The gentleman happens to live in my riding. Maybe I have a greater interest in it because of that fact. He did show to me some figures which showed, I think, it was the firm of Bradshaw in Toronto, that they were getting a very, very large portion of the purchases of textiles from the department. I think he does represent some English firms. Of course, we are all anxious to purchase as much as possible from Britain in order to stimulate trade and supply them with dollars in order to buy more of our Canadian goods. I think it is desirable that the department should purchase as much as possible from English mills when they can do so to advantage.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St.Andrew): Mr. Chairman, on Section 182 might I say just one word?

We are all impressed, I am sure, with the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions' (Mr. Foote) sincerity and with his good intentions, as well as with the ability he has shown, so far, in coming to grips with the problems of his department.

I do not want to add anything to what the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) has said about the Mercer Reformatory. I am, however, compelled to say that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions' (Mr. Foote) reply to the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) is hardly satisfactory and can only be allowed to stand without further questioning and development because the hon. member for Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) is new in his department and will, undoubtedly, study that problem more than he has had a chance to do until now.

I want to support everything that the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) has said and to add for the consideration of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) the feeling that exists in a very wide circle that Mercer needs reforming, and fundamentally so. Its regime is not conducive to a reformatory; it is an institution which is experiencing riots and outbreaks of one sort or another almost regularly. Undoubtedly that is a reflection of something that is bad in the administration, in the regime and in the policies pursued. I know the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) will pay more attention to this institution. I merely want to say these few words for the record, because I do not think that the House feels that everything possible is being done. I am sure that a lot of people would like to think that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) will pay special attention to that institution and will really reform it. It needs it badly.

Section 183 agreed to.

On Section 184.

MR. W.J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, in connection with Section 184, that deals with the Institution in Monteith, and I just want to say a word in commendation of the officials in charge of the Monteith Institution. Mr. White has done a fine job since he took over. He does everything he can to help the inmates. If the inmate has a personal problem or anything of that nature I have seen Mr. White go to a great deal of trouble to see that he is able to get assistance to solve that inmate's problem. I would like to say also the Institution is operated on a very fine basis. The inmates are permitted to work on any part of the farm. It is very gratifying to see these inmates go maybe a mile away alone with machinery to work on the farm and have them come back at night after their day's work is done. I think if any of us know of an Institution where the

officials are doing a good job it behooves us to mention it to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) or in the House.

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Chairman, I noticed that in Section 184, as in Section 182 there is an item called "Farm Expenses". There would not be any farm expenses in connection with Mercer. There is no farm involved in connection with that Institution. Does that mean expenses paid to other Institutions from which farm products are received, or what?

MR. FOOTE: Which item is this?

MR. MILLARD: "Farm Expenses" in Section 182. It also occurs, again, in Sections 184 and 185. What is "Farm Expenses"?

MR. FOOTE: Section 182? What item?

MR. MILLARD: It is item 2, four lines down on the right hand side.

MR. FOOTE: Section 182, item 2?

MR. MILLARD: Farm Expenses.

MR. FOOTE: There are six or seven acres of ground there. Those items would be for the expenses of the garden, repairs and so on. What number?

MISS MACPHAIL: Item 2, Section 182.

MR. FOOTE: I am told that that item in regard to Mercer is for gardens, items in connection with the expense of the gardening and grounds.

MISS MACPHAIL: I do not think we should pass over Burwash so lightly. That entails a large expenditure. It is the most difficult Institution possible to manage because it has one hundred percent. repeaters, and it had when I visited it. Has it cut down any or has it kept as high as ever, referring to Burwash? I would like to know is Gerald Wright still the Superintendent?

(TAKE "K" FOLLOWS)

MR. FOOTE: Well, most of the people there are repeaters and I would think it is probably the most discouraging of the institutions, but at the same time, it is surprising what is going on there in the way of recreation and community life for these people. Some of the major league hockey players have been up there, and the people there have their own hockey team and skating and shows, and I think there is a real effort made there. It is largely a working programme I know, but the type of person you get there is more difficult than the ones in the other institutions.

Vote No. 183 agreed to.

On Vote 184.

MR. F.O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) have any figures at hand to tell me how many of his staff are at Neys, and how many prisoners? The latest figures he has.

MR. FOOTE: For ---

MR. ROBINSON: For Neys.

MR. FOOTE: I will see if I can find it. I have not that information here, but I will get it for you if you like.

MR. ROBINSON: Thank you.

MR. FOOTE: My impression is that the population is rather low at Neys at the time, in proportion to the number employed -- that was the question, was it not?

MISS MACPHAIL: Yes --- the number of prisoners.

MR. FOOTE: But again, that population there is rather seasonal and you have to keep the help on to deal with the people that come there at certain times of the year.

Votes 184 to 186 inclusive agreed to.

On vote 187.

MR. G.T. GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, I spoke to a previous Minister about the situation at Burtch. I might say that the Burtch Industrial Farm is eight miles from Brantford and you get

to it by what we call "The back road", the concession road, and no buses run on that road and men find difficulty in getting to and from the institution. That is one of the great difficulties there, and I know you are experiencing quite a change in staff; men come on for three months, six months, and they find that they cannot get to work and get back home without going into the expense of hiring a car or pooling a car and so on, and they eventually resign.

I know that at the present time it is not fully staffed, and that is one of the reasons that you are having that difficulty. If you could use some of your vehicles at that institution to transport the men to and from the institution, I believe it would overcome a great deal of your difficulty in that line.

MR. FOOTE: We have six more men employed now than we did last year, according to my report. However, I realize that is a difficulty, but the real difficulty there is the matter of housing, as the hon. member (Mr. Gordon) would realize and there is not much we can do about that at the present time. However, I will look into that possibility and see what is to be done.

Votes 187 to 189 inclusive agreed to.

On vote 190.

MR. T.H. ISLEY (Waterloo South): Mr. Chairman, under 190 I notice that is now Ontario Training Schools for Girls, that is the Galt school. When is this change being made of the girls to Galt?

MR. FOOTE: The 27th of this month.

MR. ISLEY: The 27th of March?

MR. FOOTE: Yes.

MR. ISLEY: And those boys are being brought from -- or rather they are being taken from Galt to Cobourg; and is there any costs of transferring them included in this item?

MR. FOOTE: I hope so.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FOOTE: Else we will need one of those famous treasury warrants.

MR. ISLEY: Well, I mean, I was just wondering -- I cannot see the item in there that is included in it, and there must be some expenses involved. I think hon. members of this House should be entitled to know what that transfer is going to cost this province.

MR. FOOTE: Certainly they are entitled to know. I think the figure for the transportation, if I recall correctly, for the boys was around $430. I think that is the item that we have and it is not intended to transport the equipment, we want the Galt school left intact with all the equipment so the girls merely move in and take over. The boys will be moved down to Cobourg and any necessary supplies they need can be bought then. There will be no transport of materials.

I think the total cost of the move will be under $1,000 --- $437. I think, is the figure we have for moving the boys and girls. The rest of the moving will be done by our own trucks. It is not a very big item. I will give it to you if you like.

MR. J.G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) could tell us what exchanges of staff might be entailed in this exchange? I imagine there would be some of that.

MR. FOOTE: Well, there will be, but we are very pleased at the small number who are leaving. Some of the people may stay where they are and carry on maintenance duties, but of the teaching staff we have some resignations already. We regret that, but we are replacing them. I think we have had four replacements to date.

I see that we had five leaving the staff. It is regrettable. It is one thing that would make one hesitate in changing them around but, after all, we feel that the move is necessary for the good of the children and we cannot very well let the matter of the staff interfere

with it, and there has been much less in the way of disturbance than I thought there would be.

Vote 190 agreed to.

HON. G.H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Page 58, Department of Highways.

MR. J.G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, before we proceed with the vote on Highways; I presented a suggestion last year that this large item of statutory expenditures be transferred over into the other sections so that we would have some say about them. I rather received some promise that consideration would be given to this, but I find that the votes are exactly the same as they were before, and we are going to vote on a small sum of $3,000,000 out of a total of $45,000,000.

I am just wondering why this is necessary, and why that $42,000,000 cannot be put over into the other sections so we can have some say as to whether it should be approved or not, and also get some detail as to what it constitutes.

MR. DOUCETT: We give as much detail as we can, but it is under the Act and you would have to change the Act.

MR. BROWN: Then let us do that.

MR. W.H. TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Chairman, I am sure we are all glad to see the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) back on the job again. I was just wondering whether or not he would care to tell us about his operation or his sojourn in the hospital, or anything of that nature, as well as he tells us about something in the Department of Highways.

MR. DOUCETT: I might say there is nothing in the Estimates for that.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

On vote 89.

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Chairman, there are several items and I am not just exactly sure, because of what the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) has said regarding these items, there is so much of the work of the Highways Department carried under the statutory provisions in the Estimates that I do not know exactly where to bring this in, but I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) the fact that the surrounding roads around the city of Toronto running through the suburban areas possess increasing problems as to stop lights and traffic controls, policing, shoulders of roads. In the Queensway area, for an example, I know that the hon. Minister (Mr.Doucett) has had a petition presented to him recently from the residents in the Etobicoke Township area -- well, it is out here at Eatonville in the Burnhamthorpe Road district there on 27 highway. Recently -- I think last year, I raised the question of the place where they show moving pictures out there at the corner of 7 and 27. That was certainly a traffic hazard at that time. Since that time there have been many thousands of employees added to the payrolls in Malton, particularly at the A.V.R.O. Plant there and there is a great deal of traffic and congestion, and as a result of the highway accident at that point recently, the magistrate recommended that either there be traffic lights or, during the rush hours particularly, a policeman on the job.

Now, I made inquiries of the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) since this Session started, and I find it would cost somewhere in the neighborhood of $1,400 to install a traffic light at the corner of 7 and 27, and I assume that the cost would be the same or approximately the same at Weston Road.

MR. DOUCETT: I am very glad to inform the hon. member (Mr. Millard) that there is a light slated to go in at 27 and 7.

MR. MILLARD: Could the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) also tell me what is being done regarding Burnamthorpe Road and 27, because that traffic hazard is about the same.

MR. DOUCETT: I am not familiar with that corner, but I will check it for you.

MR. MILLARD: Well, a petition signed by the residents of that area I think arrived during the hon. Minister's (Mr. Doucett) absence.

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, I have not seen that yet.

MR. MILLARD: Then there is the question, Mr. Chairman, of the question of issuing licenses. I know that the people who are buying licenses are somewhat at fault in regard to this matter, but I have had a note given to me, a letter as a matter of fact signed by a man by the name of Mr. E.F. Clark. He tells us about the conditions, the overcrowded conditions and the lack of accommodation at a Shell service station in Islington where licenses were issued. There certainly was not much accommodation, and people who did arrive there had to wait long periods of time outside the building -- there was not even a waiting space inside and they had to queue up outside.

I am wondering if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) cannot, in the season of the year when licenses are being issued, in such large numbers, if some provision cannot be made to accommodate those who are trying to get their licenses without having this pile-up and having them strung along out on the street waiting in all kinds of weather, and many of them of course waiting until they have worn out their patience and then moving somewhere else trying to get a license, only to cause an additional burden there.

The third item I would like to take up is, who is going to assume the responsibility of fixing the shoulders of the road in

the Queensway area. That has been before the Deputy-Minister on several occasions. As a matter of fact, I happen to know personally that an invitation was extended and in the letter of reply by the Deputy Minister of Highways it was pointed out that this same problem exists at a large number of points immediately outside the boundaries of the city of Toronto where these highways and arteries are starting out and are running through what was township property before, largely rural. They are running now through suburban area where there are business sections and so on. Who is going to assume the responsibility? Is that partly the responsibility of the township and partly of the Highways Department of the Province, or is the province willing to take it over and see that these things are carried out.

I would like to say in the Queensway area of which I am speaking, and which is in York West, there has been virtually all Winter just a sea of mud on both shoulders of the road and between the highway and the stores that are now forming a business section in that area and the businessmen's association over there have been greatly concerned over who is going to assume this responsibility. Apparently the Department of Highways, according to the Deputy Minister, is also concerned about the same problem. I would like an answer to that question.

MR. DOUCETT: Well, Mr. Chairman, first I will take the licenses which the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) mentions. It is one of the problems that is a very difficult one to handle. When the hon. member (Mr. Millard) mentions having accommodations for the issuing of licenses at certain places, I might say that we, here in the city of Toronto, in the East Block, during this season did not have sufficient accommodation to keep the people inside. They come there, and after all, human nature is such that they do not

come specially during the period in which the licenses are being issued, but on the last week or few days -- today might be an exception. I understand that they are not so crowded today -- but they were out of the issuing centre, down the main corridor clean out at the back of the East Block, and that is what has happened in many cases. Regardless of what size the place was, unless it was a huge size, it would not accommodate them. That is what happened.

Of course, if those places are altogether too small, our inspectors, from time to time check them and try to --

MR. H.C. NIXON (Brant): Just on that point, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) permit: I think you were away ill at the time, but I think in one place the floor actually collapsed under the crowd which was waiting. I think it was Welland.

MR. DOUCETT: Yes.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): And that is a Liberal constituency.

MR. DOUCETT: That would happen to about one or two a year, you see.

MR. MILLARD: One is enough.

MR. DOUCETT: As far as this road you mentioned, I am not too familiar with the status of it. If it runs through a corporation and we build the road, then we are responsible for the roadway for it, but if we have designated or assumed the whole road and the ditches, we are responsible for the shoulders. However, I will check the matter of this particular road, because I want to be positive before I give you any definite answer, and I will be glad to let you know tomorrow.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) that consideration be given to some kind of premium payment to be paid, or that could be saved -- probably that would be

the best way of putting it --- if licenses are secured in time. This year it was necessary apparently, to extend the period of time, and I do not know whether the idea is to get them all done before the end of the fiscal year or what the proposition is, but it seems to me we ought to have either a calendar year or a fiscal year proposition, and that you might stretch out the period of securing the licenses, and therefore this overcrowding condition, if some kind of premium was to be had by purchasing earlier, could be avoided.

(TAKE "L" FOLLOWS)

Therefore, it would be an inducement to them to get their licenses and to get out of the way for those who come along at the last moment.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) care to indicate when the new parallel highway to Barrie will be open for public use? Will it be open for the coming Summer season?

MR. DOUCETT: We hope to have it opened at the very earliest possible date but at the present time, due to the great scarcity of steel, I cannot make any definite promises that it will be open in the coming year.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, to follow this question up, certainly the Department has ordered its steel well in advance. Other construction people have done so. I mentioned a brewery which managed to get its steel because it ordered it ahead of time and certainly the Department of Highways knew years ago exactly what they would require at any point, and they have made arrangements to secure the steel. The steel shortage is only relatively recent in origin and this highway has been under construction now for a great many years and it is almost unthinkable that the Department has not been far-sighted enough to secure the necessary steel in advance. With such an able hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) in charge - I should add - I would not have been surprised if it was somebody else but with this hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett), I am sure he took care of such little details.

MR. PORTER: Who are you taking a slap at now?

MR. SALSBERG: I am not slapping. I am merely

enquiring.

MR. PORTER: You make us all nervous.

MR. R.A. McKINNING (Wellington North): Mr. Chairman, the question I had had only to do with licenses. I have had some enquiries regarding instructions under the Highway Traffic Act. I believe there was a manual which was prepared and available for anybody who wanted to get it. I was wondering whether the Department would not be wise in handing one of these to everyone who is getting a license. Would it not help to educate our drivers a great deal?

MR. DOUCETT: I might say that we are very anxious to get these out. I will answer the last question first, with the permission of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg). We find, if you force them to take them, they only have to be cleaned up two or three times a day. I do not think it is wise to give out many thousands of pamphlets which are thrown around the halls, as was some of the literature which was given out last year. But we give them out, by request, and I think perhaps we gave out some two hundred thousands to two hundred and fifty thousands and that is better than having them thrown into the streets.

To the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), I might say that the feeders to the Barrie road are not yet completed and it will take some time to have them finished. We have had our overheads let for some time and they are proceeding as fast as the contractors feel they can. I do not think they will be finished this year. The by-pass certainly will not be finished. It would be useless to pour thousands of cars into, say,

Wilson Avenue, and have it cluttered up, until we have the by-pass, which is going forward as rapidly as possible.

MR. SALSBERG: On this point, it may be it would create difficulty at Wilson Avenue, if the by-pass were not completed, but the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) is undoubtedly aware of the terrific difficulty that motorists encounter outside of Barrie, now that they are limited to one road. It is no exaggeration to say that cars pile up on a Saturday afternoon for miles back and it often takes as much time to go from the outskirts of Barrie to the other side of the town, as it takes with a trip from Toronto to that part of the road.

It may be that a certain part of the highway could be opened so that, at a given point in the northbound traffic, it could be switched onto the new highway and they could continue from there, if not from Wilson Avenue, then from some point further north, which would relieve the situation around Barrie. It is not pleasant to find oneself locked up there, perhaps with one family going up north, and be compelled to stand there an hour and a half on certain afternoons.

MR. F.O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say how delighted we were up in our part in the country to learn from the press that we can expect the paving of the road to Kenora this year and also the link to Atikokan. I have had some complaints from certain truckers in the Geraldton area that they are only receiving six cents a mile for trucking gravel. This is lower than it was a few years ago.

I do not really know how to answer the inquiries,

when the trucker said this price was set by the government. I would appreciate if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) could give me some information on that point.

MR. DOUCETT: Are you talking about contractors or about the government?

MR. ROBINSON: In reply to that, that question crossed my mind and I wrote to the party and asked him if this was a contract or a price set by the government and the reply I received was it was set by the government.

MR. DOUCETT: There is no such price set.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) care to make a statement on the progress of the negotiations which went on between Ontario and the Dominion of Canada with regard to the Trans-Canada Highway and the route of that highway through Ontario? Up in the northern part of Southern Ontario there is some concern, because a map was published on the 25th of April last year showing the highway leaving Ottawa, swinging down to Carleton Place, down to Peterborough-Ontario, then up to Lindsay-Ontario, then up to Parry Sound-Ontario, and finally up to Sudbury-Ontario --

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is the shortest distance between two points.

MR. DENNISON: Which takes this route through a largely settled section of the province. This was rather than continue straight up the Ottawa Valley, right up to Highway No. 17 to Sudbury. It did amaze the people at North Renfrew at the time and there was

a protest meeting held and, following the protest meeting, a certain hon. Minister of the Crown, I understand, gave these people to understand their highway was going to be the Trans-Canada Highway. Does that mean the route by way of Peterborough and Lindsay has been changed?

MR. DOUCETT: No, you are absolutely right. The Trans-Canada will go either way, from the Quebec boundary, then to Ottawa, by Highway 17, go on to Pembroke, on to North Bay, and across to Sudbury.

MR. JOLLIFFE: How many are there going to be?

MR. DOUCETT: There are going to be the two ways. Then, there will be another starting from Toronto and connecting at Barrie, if you wish, to the highway which is in the agreement and which Ottawa will subsidize, the one from the Quebec boundary, wherever that point will be agreed upon, if and when Quebec signs, and from there leading to the Capitol, on to Route 13, Route No. 7, through Peterborough, across the Wabashene, and on out through the north. Does that satisfy you?

(TAKE "M" FOLLOWS)

MR DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, I think if we are getting Federal Funds for it and if these Federal Funds will give Ontario an extra route I can see a certain amount of logic in the extra route. I am wondering, however, if the fact that the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) lives in Carleton Place and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in Lindsay, and the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) at Peterborough and another hon. Minister at Parry Sound had anything to do with this extra route?

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) while I know what he is talking about, that the Department of Highways certainly carried on a great deal of research on this and got a lot of information and some day if he would come to my office I would give him some figures that would actually amaze him from the registration, the population and the incoming tourists. After all, the capital of Ontario, 90% of the tourists who come into Ontario must go there if they are going to the north-land and it is of great interest to the Province of Ontario to see that this huge tourist traffic gets across to the sections that they are interested in on a reasonably good highway. If we contribute to a trans-Canada highway we are greatly interested in that phase of the futre of the Province of Ontario. If you wish to come to my office I will show you where some five million cars registered into the Province of Ontario in one year. That does not mean to say that the five million started to visit our great north-land, but many of them will and I am sure that if they were going through, they would come

down from Fort Erie, Niagara, Windsor -- Windsor being the largest entry point in the Province of Ontario, and across probably north of Toronto and come to the City of Toronto and then to the nearest direct and best highway. This road will carry the largest traffic. When you talk about Highway 17, I might say Highway 17 at the present has a very splendid surface and one which will carry the traffic for many years in the future. I doubt if we will need in the next few years to build a wider road to carry any more traffic than you can accommodate at the present time.

MR. HOUCK: The hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) has mentioned the number of cars coming across the Peace Bridge at Fort Erie. I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) can tell me when they will build the other side of the Queen Elizabeth from Fort Erie to Niagara Falls?

MR. DOUCETT: Well, we are doing some research on that at the present time to see if it warrants it. As soon as it warrants it it will be built.

MR. T.H. ISLEY (Waterloo, South): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) could give us an idea of where the supposed highway is going to go from Ottawa to Windsor? Would it be, in other words, near the city of Kitchener or between Kitchener and Preston? Has that road been decided upon?

MR. DOUCETT: We are just developing that at the present time, we have to have that before too long.

MR. ISLEY: I would like to point out to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) that there is quite a feeling in that district on this matter. We feel if that highway

going across the province could run through between these industrial cities, you would save a lot of traffic going through the feeder lines going into this highway could go in from both sides if you would travel anywhere between Kitchener and Galt. I see no reason why, for instance, the Town of Preston, should be burdened with the traffic from the cities of Kitchener and Waterloo going through the town of Preston to connect on to that highway. I think it should be situated somewhere where your feeder lines come in from both sides and I imagine the department will give that consideration.

There is one other thing that was in my mind and I mentioned it here when I spoke in the house, the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) was not here and that is the possibility of the Department taking over a section of highway in the County of Waterloo. This road, leading off Preston northwards across the newly developed airport of the Wellington-Waterloo Airport crossing No. 7 highway at Breslau and leading up through Conestogo and going to St. Jacobs to No. 86.

MR. DOUCETT: A county road?

MR. ISLEY: It is a county road at the present time, but the amount of traffic that road takes, I think would warrant it being a Provincial highway, especially now that the airport is now situated on that road and this road connects at St. Jacobs to No. 85. Then there is another link that I feel should be connected and that is to Highway 24 which is coming out of Guelph and connecting over to this county road. It is a link that goes from this county road which has just

been completed, but I think to make the whole highway system a good, sound, interlocking system, I think those are two roads that can be taken into consideration by the Department of Highways.

MR. DOUCETT: In reply to your question regarding the new road, we are carrying out very extensive surveys and we certainly are checking each possibility, but I want to make it very clear that this road will not go through any town or city. Now, on your last point, I know the road you are talking about, I have had a deputation to see mee, but as much as I would like to do something for Waterloo, there are many other fine counties in the Province of Ontario who are asking for further extensions of Kings Highways from county roads and until we have certain roads that are already in the system drawn up to their reasonable standard, we will not be designating any new ones.

MR. ISLEY: I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) it has been a long time since the County of Waterloo has had any routes taken into the highway system, it has been a long number of years and in view of that I do not think -- I thought probably the Department would take at least that short distance into consideration to appease all the troubles we have had in the County and to appease people in municipal life within the County.

MR. JOELIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I see that it is almost six o'clock and I want to make a suggestion to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett). It was only a few days ago that the report of the Royal Commission on Transportation was made public, The Turgeon report.

Now, I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) when we resume later tonight that he be prepared to make a statement about the attitude of the government toward that report. I think he will agree it was a very important report on a very broad subject, but whatever may be the attitude of the government of an earlier day, there are certainly matters dealt with in that report which are of very much interest to the Ontario Department of Highways, and to our system of transportation in Ontario. I do not think I need elaborate on the question, but I do say that we should not complete this session without learning what the attitude of the government is towards the recommendations in that report because it may in the end turn out to be a milestone of great importance in the history of transportation in this country, including Ontario.

MR. F.O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, we have about a minute left. I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) would agree to indicate the route the highway will follow from Parry Sound to the Lakehead.

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, it will go through Sudbury to Chapleau and there is a little piece there that is in doubt across by White River and Nipigon, Marathon and on to the head of the lakes, and from there pretty much the present highway No. 17 with new alignment.

MR. CALDER: I put a question on the order paper asking if the Trans-Canada highway was two feet narrower in Ontario than the rest of the country. The answer was "It will be built according to agreement".

MR. DOUCETT: I might say that each province

has an agreement with the Federal government and each agreement was that this highway could be built a minimum of 22 feet and that is what we are building, 22 feet to 24 feet. We will get subsidies on 22 feet or 24 feet, if we go over that, of course, we would have to pay for it ourselves. However, we are building a 22 foot pavement with a grade according to the territory which it is passing through. It depends on the traffic you get. Up in the north country where the traffic would be lighter and the country very rugged, we probably would have our shoulders narrower than in open country where the traffic would be heavier and there will be a one hundred foot right-of-way regardless of where it is.

It being six of the clock, the committee took recess.

- - - - - - -

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

———•———

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

———•———

Volume XXXIV

TUESDAY, MARCH 20TH, 1951

EVENING SESSION

———•———

At eight of the clock the committee resumes.

On Vote 89

MR.J.L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr.Chairman, I repeatedly laid the question of the Burlington Beach Highway and the Bridge. I realize the diffinulty at the present time to building any highway or bridge because of the lack of certain materials, but the hon. Minister (Mr.Doucett) visited Hamiltonand spoke to the automobile club and to the G ood Roads Association there and he said that he would see experts of international reputation in both tunnel ahd bridge construction and their advice would form a part of the necessary information. I would like to know if the hon. Minister (Mr.Doucett) has sought any advice from anyone on the right type of construction for that highway and bridge. That was last June when the Hon. Minister (Mr.Doucett) promised the Hamilton Club he would seek this advice. Have you done anything along those lines?

MR. DOUCETT: No, our survey is not yet complete.

MR. T.D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr.Chairman, on Vote 89, Item 1, salaries areup $100,000 this year over last year. Would the hon. Minister (Mr.Doucett) care to comment on that?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, I might say there is a slight increase in salaries and there willprobably be an additional 60 to 70 employees that will go on the permanent staff during this year which will put that item up.

MR. C.C. CALDER (London): Would the hon. Minister (Mr.Doucett) tell us what improvement there has been in the percentage of casual employees?

MR. DOUCETT: Well, there has been a decided change in that, that is why we are putting these on gradually, the casual employees, There has been a decided change, I could

not give you the exact figure.

MR. CALDER: Would you give me some figures on it?

MR. DOUCETT: I have not any figures here, but I will be glad to give them to you later if you would like.

MR.L.E. WISMER (Riverdale): The question of casual employeed has come up, the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) says he does not know how many casual employees there are in his Department. I presume a lot of the casual employees would be for work on highways and we might bring it up under a later vote. Perhaps some information could be obtained by them.

Vote 89 agreed to.

MR. DOUCETT: Well, the casual employees, they are on from time to time and in the Department of Highways sometimes it might go to several thousand, especially in the summer time.

MR. G.I.HARVEY (Sault Ste. Marie): Under this vote of 25 million dollars for Kings Highway--

MR. DOUCETT: What item is that?

MR. HARVEY: No. 90, Kings Highway Development, roads 25 million dollars. I presume that is an appropriation for the Trans-Canada highway?

MR. DOUCETT: Is that the item of 25 million.

MR. HARVEY: What part of the estimate is devoted to the Trans-Canada Highway, what appropriation is there here for the Trans -Canada Highway?

MR. DOUCETT: Well, that depends, that is the total amount we are going to spend, that is ordinary, there would not be much for the Trans-Canada Highway. There would be no new construction except in some of the old roads that is now designated to Trans-Canada. There would be maintenance not

chargeable to that item, that is all still o4dinary.

MR. HARVEY: We in Sault Ste. Marie are interested in the Trans-Canada Highway and I think the subject was brought and we are quite disappointed it is not designated in around Sault Ste. Marie on the north Montreal river. We are not quite satisfied that the present designated Trans-Canada Highway will be ultimately the highway over which people willtravel to travel over Canada or over Ontario. First of all, I want to say that the Trans-Canada Highway where it enters Ontario at Hawkesbury would be closer to home for the hon. Minister of Travel & Publicity (Mr. Cecile) having come from Ottawa, the home of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr.Dunbar) at Carleton Place, the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) and then Peterborough, the hon. Minister of Lands & Forests (Mr.Scott) and then to Lindsay, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and then I think it almost touches Sunderland, the home of the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr.Welsh),and then of course it travels on to Sudbury to the home of the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Gemmell). Now we think the detour of about 140 miles an unnecessary detour instead of travelling a straight line north, and so we have re-named it not Trans-Canada Highway, but "Trans-Cabinet" Highway.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HARVEY: I also want to point out that the part that is going right through Sudbury, through Heron Bay or White River will get completely new road and we feel that is a lot of expense,and a lot of extra road that should not be built, that is, not for a Trans-Canada Highway for tourists because we feel that the Department has already a road 80 miles north of Sault Ste. Marie, which is the most logical road to use. We feel

that as it now stands, the tourists that enter Canada from the States through Sault Ste. Marie go in there and spend there money in Sault Ste. Marie, we feel if you built a road around the lake shore, it would add considerable revenue to the province and we are unselfish about this, we feel that is the way it should be built.

Vote 90 agreed to.

On Vote 91.

MR.W.J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane,South): Under Vote 91, I was wondering if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) would mind explaining why a municipal road branch is listed under Vote 91 and on the opposite page we have the same heading again with a different set of figures.

MR. DOUCETT: On. No. 9 Vote 91, Municipal Roads under Ordinary and then you go over to the other item and that is under capital, B ut the item is not the same one, is 11 and the other is 15, one is Capital and one Ordinary.

MR.GRUMMETT: They are both statutory, I was wondering why, how is that up?

MR. DOUCETT: Two different types of work, which seems to put it in the "Kings Highway".

MR. GRUMMETT: 91 is only one item ordinary, all the remainder are statutory.

MR. DOUCETT: This item is also statutory, but it is under Ordinary expenses, No,that is right, it is statutory.

(TAKE "BB" FOLLOWS)

MR. CRUMMETT: I am just wondering, why not put this all under one heading?

MR. DOUCETT: Well, one, in other words, might be maintenance expenditure, another is capital expenditure; you see?

MR. L.E. WISMER (Riverdale): I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) would explain what this item of $1,000,000. , "roads in unincorporated townships in Northern Ontario", represents? Just what is to be done with that money?

MR. DOUCETT: Well, that is an amount of money which we spend on unincorporated townships. We have incorporated townships, statute labour boards which might be unincorporated, and then there are unincorporated townships as well as our improvement districts, and so on. This is an amount for unincorporated townships, which takes in many townships in the North.

MR. GRUMMETT: And the $500,000. on the opposite page will be for the contruction of new roads in the same areas, would it not?

MR. DOUCETT: Pardon?

MR. GRUMMETT: The $500,000. under the same heading on the opposite page - would that be for new roads?

MR. DOUCETT: Is that in capital?

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes, in statutory--capital.

MR. DOUCETT: Well, that is a capital amount again, see? $500,000. capital and $1,000,000. ordinary for maintenance.

MR. WISMER: Is this Vote 91, where it is being expended on unincorporated townships, is there any municipal work done there?

MR. DOUCETT: Not if it is unincorporated, because there is no municipality--no, municipal organization, I mean. The municipality is there but no organization.

MR. WISMER: I think the Committee should know that this $1,000,000. in Vote 91 for the building of roads in unincorporated townships was part of the $100,000,000. which the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) made a good deal of in his Budget speech as aid to municipalities. Now we find there is no municipality.

MR. DOUCETT: There is a municipality.

MR. WISMER: But you say --

MR. DOUCETT: I think the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) will agree that it is a pretty good thing to do some work for those municipalities.

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In Northern Ontario there are a great number of areas that are not under municipal organization and, therefore, the government has to take on the construction of the roads in those areas. Take, for instance, Cochrane South. I think there are only 14 organized municipalities in that constituency, of which four or five at least are towns, leaving about eight or nine townships in a very large area. The roads in the unorganized townships which have no municipal organization, that has to be taken on by the government.

MR. DOUCETT: Well, then, we have government statute labour boards, as you know.

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes.

MR. DOUCETT: As well. Which we subsidize and help.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Chairman,

a couple of years ago I drew to the attention of the hon. Minister's (Mr. Doucett) Department the difficulty of southern access to the city of Hamilton. I made mention of a tunnel at that time. That would be a big engineering project and perhaps it is not too feasible but the fact remains that access into and out of Hamilton from the south side is very difficult and the taxpayers of Hamilton have passed a project this year for $750,000. - a road widening to make a four-lane highway and cut the grade down to 5%. That will cost $750,000. I know they hope to get approximately one-third grant from the Department.

But I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) and the Department ever contemplated lending some other assistance in the matter of Hamilton and other municipalities who are faced with peculiar topography problems of that type. I mean, it is unusual and it is important to the people of the province that access be had into a municipality like Hamilton and it should not be the full responsibility of the real estate people in Hamilton - the taxpayers - to pay for something that is of necessity for all the motorists of Ontario. I think that the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) could consider an additional road, or perhaps giving more assistance to that already passed by the taxpayers.

MR. DOUCETT: Well, of course, many municipalities have those problems which are in line with that. Some municipalities have more rock than others, other municipalities have drainage problems; they all have their own peculiar problem. This one mentioned is one which I think there has been some survey on and I understand

the estimated cost is $2,000,000. or more.

Vote 91 agreed to.

On Vote 92.

MR. J.L. EASTON (Wentworth): We have not passed 92 yet, have we? Could I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett), did he ever consider remitting the whole of the gasoline tax that is paid by the municipalities and spent on municipal vehicles? It seems to me a very bad principle for the people to be taxed twice on the same -- I will put it this way -- they have paid the real estate taxes on the municipality, then that money is spent on gasoline to run the municipal vehicles, and then it is taxed again. That is a tax upon a tax. I believe that is a very bad principle and I would like to see the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) remitting the whole of that tax back to the municipality.

Hamilton would save about $23,000. by that method alone. It is not a very great deal but every little helps when municipal taxes are rising the way they are today.

MR. DOUCETT: Well, of course, every municipality might want the same thing.

MR. EASTON: Sure, but that is what I am asking for - for all the municipalities. It is a bad principle to tax real estate twice.

Vote 92 agreed to.

On Vote 93.

MR. H.C. NIXON(Brant): On 93, there was a matter I was going to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett). I think I can attach it to motor vehicles and safety on the highways.

On Number 5 Highway in particular, there is a tremendous lot of trucking now of brick and cement block and tile and I find, in going over the road as I do several times a day, and particularly in our local village - as you know, the road is very narrow and very winding; it isavery unfortunate way in which that road was put through the village of St. George - that road is littered every day with brick and tile and cement blocks for these trucks are loaded with tremendous loads on an absolutely flat platform without any sides to contain the load. We have scores of school children walking up the highway every morning and noon and evening within a very few feet of where these trucks pass and as they come around those sharp curves, sometimes the bricks simply fly and shatter themselves upon the highway. I wonder that there has not been serious accidents before this.

It seems to me it has pretty nearly come to the time we will have to regulate the manner in which these loads are put on these flat trucks, that they should be built so that the brick and tile and cement blocks cannot fly off at every rough spot or curve that they come to in the road.

Has my hon. friend (Mr. Doucett) ever given that consideration?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, this is a matter which has come to our attention many times, I might say to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and it is one of great importance. In our Traffic Act it states that they must be properly packed. It is taken care of in that way but still those vehicles travel and the brick

drops off and you do not know whose truck it drops off. Of course, it is a very difficult thing to patrol every road. We do have our patrolmen to keep them clean as much as possible but the whole thing is to get the offender in order to prosecute him. We have it in the Act but the thing is to enforce it. It is a difficult matter and quite a serious one which the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) has mentioned.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, under 93, the Motor Vehicles Branch, I would again like to bring to the hon. Minister's (Mr. Doucett) attention the fact that under the statutory item later on, under this Branch we are providing $700,000. of the taxpayers' money to make up for the Unsatisfied Judgments Fund, or unsatisfied claims in courts that are referred to this fund and paid out of the fund. Now, that is $700,000. of the revenue of this province going into something which I do not think the revenue of this province should be used for. I think this province should set up a proper automobile insurance fund of its own.

MR. W.H. TEMPLE (High Park): Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: To be paid by the motorist with his license when he purchases it in the Spring and to provide protection to the motorist, more protection than he is getting today, and I am sure if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) would take a poll or a vote of the motorists of this province and put the facts before them, they would vote for this scheme by 85%. I am quite sure of that.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: Now, each year we have the example of Saskatchewan where this scheme has been in successful operation for many years and each year the scheme of Saskatchewan is proving its worth.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): There is a loss every year.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DUNBAR: By tonight's paper, a couple of hundred thousand dollars.

MR. DENNISON: We will deal with this. The Saskatchewan scheme is still in good financial condition.

MR. DUNBAR: So is this.

MR. DENNISON: The scheme was never set up to make money and yet they have on their over-all operation, since the inauguration of the scheme, had a very sizeable surplus - I believe it is in the neighbourhood of 200--in the neighborhood of $1,000,000.

AN hon. MEMBER: Make it two million.

MR. R.A. McEWING (Wellington North): That rose fast.

MR. DENNISON: Let me just give you the rates that are charged in Saskatchewan as compared to right across the border in Manitoba and right across the border in Alberta where the government there - I am referring to Manitoba and Alberta - like the government in Ontario, just lets the poor motorist take his changes with the insurance companies, take "pot luck" as we used to say on the farm.

In Saskatchewan the motorist gets this for a premium of only $10.: he gets a $100. deductible clause; he gets a public liability of $5,000. and $10,000.;

he gets property damage coverage of $1,000. with $100. deductible; he gets a $100. deductible fire and theft; he gets certain insurance on his passengers; and he gets a life insured certificate on his own life of $10,000. in case of death, of $2,000. in case of dismemberment, of $2,400. in case of loss of income and $125. for funeral expenses.

Now that is over and above anything we get in Ontario and yet, for similar coverage in Ontario -- oh, yes, I want to finish the Saskatchewan picture first: in addition to that $10., a Saskatchewan motorist can pay $17.50 extra and he gets a package policy which gives him collision insurance with only $25. deductible; it increases his public liability to $20,000. and $40,000. limit; it increases his property damage to $5,000. with no deductible; it increases his fire and theft with $100. deductible, passenger hazards limits $20,000. and $40,000.--it even gives him wind, storm, hail storm and flood damage, which we have never got in Ontario.

MR. DOUCETT: No?

MR. DENISON: Aircraft, explosion--

MR. DUNBAR: Ever hear of snow storms?

MR. DENISON: He will have insurance on his automobile radio through fire, collision or theft.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN hon. MEMBER: Don't laugh.

(TAKE "CC" FOLLOWS)

He also has insurance against riot in Saskatchewan.

MR. PORTER: What is that?

MR. DENNISON: Insurance against riot.

MR. PORTER: We do not have riots down here.

MR. DENNISON: You never can tell what you people might have some day. The fact is that in Saskatchewan the motorist has complete protectionfor a total of $28.50 a year. You may say that the private companies cannot do it. Wawanesa Insurance went into Saskatchewan last year and it offered this package policy for $16.60; in other words, Wawanesa Insurance is giving to the motorist in Saskatchewan for about $2 8.50 what the same company are charging motorists in Ontario $83.70 for, and what the same company charges the motorist of Alberta $149. for,and the motorist of Manitoba $119. for.

MR.DOUCETT: There are only 200,000 cars in Alberta.

MR. DENNISON: I think this is very serious. We have approximately one million cars, vehicles,registered in Ontario, to take a round figure. If you could save the motorist of Ontario $50. apiece by inagurating a Province of Ontario insurance scheme you would save the motorist of Ontario $50,000,000.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: In other words, you could pretty nearly abandon the gasoline tax, you could pretty nearly abandon the licence fee and you could sell us the insurance at the same rate we are paying today, and you would have enough money left to build your roads -- you might even be able to go down to Southern Peru for a holiday.

The Insurance Companies argue that conditions are different in Ontario. We know they are different and yet I have given you the Ontario figures, I have given you the Manitoba

figures and the Alberta figures. The insurance companies actually charge more in Alberta and Manitoba than they do in Ontario. I repeat, they actually charge more. If you go to British Columbia they charge $158. for the same insurance. In the Province of Quebec you really get stung, they charge $222.70 for the same insurance the province of Saskatchewan sells for $28.50. I say this is an opportunity for the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr.Doucett) to make himself a most popular man, to thrust the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) completely out of the position of the most popular man in the government ranks and to make himself one of the most popular men in this province. On his side he will have every motorist in the province of Ontario, I am sure.

MR.McEWING: Every lady.

MR. DENNISON: The insurance companies will be lined four ranks deep against the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) He will have them arrayed out in the battle field in opposition to him -- but he will have the people behind him. It is not an unusual suggestion. This old province of Ontario is a public ownership province. We have pioneered public ownership of Hydro in this province, we have set an example to the world in good Hydro administration under public ownership. Are we going to sit back and let Saskatchewan -- a little, tiny province with only one-tenth of our resources -- save its motorists all this money and do things we should be doing? Under this administration we are falling back. There was a time we led the whole Dominion of Canada in the advancement of public ownership of such utilities and what should rightfully be public enterprise such as this.

I want to again urge the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) with all the force I can command that this is

something the motorist would back him up 100% on if he would inaugurate it in Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. G .H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, I am not going to go into a whole lot of detail on compulsory insurance but I do want to say to the hon. member for St. David (Mr.Dennison) that since the Act was passed by this House he is the third man out of our four and one half million people who has criticized the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund.

SOME hon.MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. DOUCETT: Just a moment; I have the floor, I hope.

We at the time invited criticism, we invited advise. It was thoroughly discussed in this House. I am not debating what you pay in Texas, Mexico, Alberta or Saskatchewan. After all, Saskatchewan has about 200,000 cars as against 1,100,000 in the province of Ontario and the province of Ontario has a million more tourists as I said this afternoon and, what this government is interested in is giving protection across the board to every person.

MR. MILLARD: The insurance companies?

MR. DOUCETT: What this Act has done for the people of Ontario and for our visitors --

MR. MILLARD: For our insurance companies.

MR. DOUCETT: ---from Saskatchewan, from Alberta, from Quebec, from any other province within the Dominion and from the whole of America, is that this Unsatisfied Judgment Fund covers all of them to the limit.

In the province of Ontario we could have compulsory insurance, as you have mentioned but it would not give those unfortunate people who got this item of $700,000 out of the

Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, one cent of protection, because we have no right to say to the people of the province of Quebec or to the people in any other province in this Dominion, that "In order for you to enter the province of Ontario you must present us with an insurance policy or some protection for our people".

SOME hon.MEMBERS: Hear,hear.

MR. DOUCETT: I do not think this province would have any authority, or would wish to have any authority, to say to those over five million tourists who enter from one end of our borders to the other that "Before you enter this province you must have some protection to travel on our roads." We are glad to have them and we receive their many millions of dollars which go into every walk of life. This Unsatisfied Judgment Fund costs each driver of an automobile .50¢ per year, which is the most up to the present time which has been charged. The Act permits us to charge $1.00. We have not needed the $1.00 yet. The .50¢ has taken care of it up to the present time. I would be glad to tell the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) that the first $5,000. or maximum for one person to collect was acitizen of the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DOUCETT: Just last night probably some hon. members of this House read in the paper of another rather peculiar Judgment, but, still, it will be paid out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund.

I gave considerable thought to this. I got all the Information I could from Massachesetts, the only State with compulsory insurance in the Union; I got information from other provinces; I got what information I could from England and many

other countries. After giving the matter very careful consideration I thought that this was the best thing that we could introduce and at a very minimum fee. I am pleased to report to this House, Mr. Chairman, that last year we had a deputation here from the State of New York composed of three very outstanding men, one of them a Judge, who said it was the finest thing he had ever seen. We were the first in the world to have anything of its kind. We have other places in the United States scrutinizing it very carefully and I think that this or a similar plan will be in effect in many places in the United States of America before long.

I have not apologies whatever to offer to the hon. member for St. David (Mr.Dennison) nor have I any desire to become this great monster which the hon. member for St. David (Mr.Dennison) mentions, but if I have done anything else in my time as Minister of Highways I think I may say this is a move which has helped many hundreds of unfortunate people in our province, in the United States and in other provinces of our Dominion.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear,hear.

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Chairman, I am getting to think now the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) has ambitions andis challenging the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) for boasting about this government, its firsts, and unexcelled anywhere.

The point I want to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) is the question of school busses under this heading of "Safety" in this vote. There was a vote on Central School Transportation facilities in a township near Hamilton .. One of the arguments used against the

transportation of Central school idea was the fact that a school bus near Simcoe had stopped to let a child off and that child had been run over by a passing vehicle and killed. Those who were opposed to the Central School Transportation system in the particular township to which I refer used that.

Last year and the year before I raised this question with the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) in his estimates. I think the time has arrived when we ought to take safety measures in two respects; one, I believe we ought to stop all traffic coming and going when a school bus stops to pick up or discharge children in order that they may cross our highways safely without the dangers of on-coming traffic in the other lane and: two, the other point I would like to raise with the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr.Doucett), before I ask a specific question is the problem of proper guards on the back of trucks. On our highways are, I think the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) will know by the number of licences which are being issued, we have more and more smaller cars, which creates a particular hazard when they run underneath the back of a truck which is unprotected. It seems to me the manufacturers of these trucks without a great deal of expense could put a safety guard which would be a safety guard braced from the frame of the truck which would stop any kind of car from running underneath the rear end and shearing off the hood and pushing the engine right back to the driver,as so often happens, I am strongly advocating (1) the stopping of school busses for the loading and unloading of children,(2) proper protection against collision at the rear end of heavy trucks and that they be properly protected by a substantial bumper fastened to the frame which

would stop cars from running underneath.

The question I want to ask is: How many school busses are there now licenced in Ontario, because it seems to me that the school transportation problem is growing and makes more necessary this traffic regulation which will stop traffic while children are getting on or getting off school busses.

(TAKE "DD" FOLLOWS)

MR. J.G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Before the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) answers that question, possibly he could answer this one at the same time. What type of travelling is there involved in connection with the Motor Vehicles' Branch that requires an expenditure of $40,000.00?

MR. DOUCETT: What type of which?

MR. BROWN: Travelling expense. That is on Vote 93, the first item. It is the same vote that the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) is on.

MR. DOUCETT: Is that the $40,000.00?

MR. BROWN: That is right.

MR. DOUCETT: There will no doubt be an increase in the mileage in the next year, it is only an increase of about $5,000.00.

MR. BROWN: Who is it meant for, what type of travelling is it?

MR. DOUCETT: Well, our inspectors. To the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard), in the school buses there are so many different types, of course, some of them are really not buses while probably they are licensed for such, the figure is around $1,320.00.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, has the hon. Minister, Mr. Doucett, anything to say on the question of traffic regulations to stop traffic while buses are ---

MR. DOUCETT: I might say we have given that considerable thought and I would like to some day, during this session, give you a little survey that we have made of the school buses in the Province of Ontario. It is only a few years since buses started in operation to any great extent and I would think there are probably - from looking through a book I have - there are pretty near as many types of buses as there are numbers. They have everything in the line of a school bus. Now, there is some danger, I think, in passing a regulation until we have some standardization in the line of buses.

MR. MILLARD: You can standardize color, could you not?

MR. DOUCETT: You might, but you have ordinary motor vehicles, five passenger cars, seven passenger cars; you have these old army four-wheel drive trucks; you have jeeps and everything imaginable, and we are giving this very careful consideration as we feel certainly something has to be done, but we have to move a little with the buses. They are operated too ---

MR. R.A. McEWING (Wellington North): Regarding the Safety Responsibility Act, I would like to say a word or two on that. I would like to commend the government in bringing in that Act. I think it is one of the best things we have had for some time and I think they deserve credit, not quite all the credit that the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) takes, as being the first in the world, because Manitoba had it previous to Ontario.

MR. DOUCETT: Not the unsatisfied judgment fund.

MR. McEWING: Yes, they have the Unsatisfied Judgment.

MR. DOUCETT: They had the Impounding Law.

MR. McEWING: They call it the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund; I discussed it with the Minister of Finance in Manitoba and that is what they call it and it was based on the same principle and operates practically the same. I think it was a good deal off it that you fashioned this here. Nevertheless, I think it is a good move and I think the government deserves credit for having put this into operation.

Now, the other thing that I wanted to say something about when it started and the hon. Member for York West (Mr. Millard) spoke of it, was regarding the school buses. Mr. Chairman - I think there is a Bill on the order sheet in my name at the present time awaiting the return of the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) before it was to be taken up, but the point that the Minister brought out was so many different vehicles are being used it would be hard to

know how to regulate it. Now, I think if you look in the proposed Act it specified that a sign, a School Bus sign, must be displayed on the rear end of that vehicle in a very prominent place so people would know. Now, we have mail carriers; mail carriers do not use the same kind of vehicles and they use a mail carrier sign which is attached to that. It is the same idea and I hope something can be worked out in that way because we have had a number of very serious accidents and a number of people who have lost their lives. It is only recently there was a very serious accident in that same way, and I hope the government will take this seriously and can see their way clear to bringing in something that would meet that requirement because, as he says, buses and pupils have so recently increased to the amount that they have, that is why they are giving it serious consideration. All the more reason why it is necessary, not only to get the consideration, but to do something.

Now, while I am on my feet, there is one question in Vote 93 perhaps the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) can give us a little information on - this highway safety publicity. In the last four years, I think there has been $100,000.00 in these estimates. Could the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) give us an idea of what has been spent say, in the last two years. On that item -- we understand these estimates are guesswork but you will know what was spent in the last two years.

MR. DOUCETT: I have not the two years, I have last year.

MR. McEWING: I am wondering what the increase was, where the money has been going and what was spent last year.

MR. DOUCETT: Oh yes, we used our full estimate, plus about $40,000.00.

MR. McEWING: You do not know about the year previous?

MR. DOUCETT: No, but I will get it to you tomorrow.

MR. McEWING: Well, you are not increasing your activity if

you use $140,000 last year and still have only $100,000 this year. Is there not the same need as ever?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, and we may use it too.

MR. McEWING: Why not state $150,000?

MR. BROWN: That is the very point.

MR. G.B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Chairman, I want to direct a few remarks to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) under the heading of Highway Safety. Last year, I believe 792 lives were lost on our highways, and while I appreciate the hon. Minister (Mr.Doucett) and his Department are much concerned about it and approaching it from every angle, I think I have a few suggestions to make to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) that I think are worth consideration. One is with respect to our present system of issuing drivers' licenses. Now, you can go in and get a driver's license and it is practically in perpetuity as long as you live and do not get in a serious accident. However, during the course of the lifetime it is possible the physical condition of the individual changes considerably, blindness comes on and so on down the line, but, nevertheless, the individual has the right to go in and get a renewal on his driver's license. I suppose the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) will agree with me that as a consequence of that there are many who are driving vehicles on the highways today who could not possibly pass a physical test if there was one for driving. The suggestion has been made to me on several occasions that the present system is wrong to the extent that the individual has a very light examination in respect of his ability to drive a car and with the crowded conditions of our highways today, driving a car is a major operation and probably the province should consider the tightening up of the issue of drivers' licenses and try to bring about a greater degree of control as to who operates cars on the highways.

Another suggestion I would like to make to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett), I know he is prepared to give it consideration. If you look in the used car lots throughout our cities you will find many jalopies for sale for $50.00, $100.00; cars that should never be allowed on the highways or on the streets of our cities, yet they are allowed to sell them irrespective of the condition of the car. As a consequence we find many young people buying these so-called jalopies for a matter of $100.00 and consequently many accidents have been caused through that. I think there should be an attempt to try to regulate the type of cars that are being sold on our used car lots throughout the province, and definitely no car should be allowed to be sold by any individual that is not in a fit mechanical condition. I pass that suggestion along.

Another suggestion I would like to make to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett), I think probably he has heard of it before, is with respect to the slow drivers on our ordinary highways, on our two-car highways, that present a problem. We have a speed limit of 50 miles an hour and consequently you get somebody driving along at 45 or 50 miles an hour and you get somebody out for a Sunday afternoon cruise on a highway where people are trying to get some place and they are moving along at 15 or 20 miles an hour. That has resulted in many accidents and should be stopped. It is alright on the dual or four-lane highways where there is a line of traffic for slow drivers but on our busy highways, especially in southwestern Ontario, I think it is not only necessary to have a maximum speed but it is also necessary to have a minimum speed. In other words, when they are on the highways they should at least move along so they do not hold up traffic and endanger the lives of others who come onto the slow driver too quickly.

There is one more suggestion I would like to make to the hon. Minister (Mr.Doucett) in respect to safety on our highways, that is one being carried out in the United States today. Once a year every

motorist must have an inspection and certificate for brakes, wheel, muffler, and all the mechanical condition of the car or else he may not get his driver's license or get a renewal of his license on that car. I think we are getting to the stage where the expenditures on our highways are so great and the highways are so crowded we have to consider making a more serious attempt to try to regulate the type of cars and tye type of drivers that are going to use our highways to protect the others who are there also.

I make these suggestions to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) in all seriousness. I know his Department is much concerned about it but I think 792 lives lost on our highways last year is far too great and every measure must be taken to determine what are the causes of the accidents and what can be done to try to cut them down.

I would like to make this suggestion also, the fact that there is reason to believe that the Highway Traffic Act itself is in need of revision and I have reference to some of the judgments that have been handed down in our Courts within the past year. Not so long ago a magistrate in the Province of Ontario gave a judgment that a motorist did not have to stop at a stop sign, and while it was appealed and not upheld, nevertheless, he had very strong reasoning in giving that particular decision and it had to go to an Appeal Court to upset it. If the Highway Traffic Act itself is not clear enough and wide enough that a magistrate can dismiss a case of reckless driving like going through a Stop sign, then I think there are sections of the Act that ought to be revised.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Ellis) I might say that our applicants must take a declaration as to their physical ability and The Highway Traffic Act at the present time provides prosecution for unnecessarily slow driving. Now, when you mention all that we have done for many of

these people who are unable to drive, it may be very interesting to you to know that we are doing quite a bit for them, but we are willing to have any suggestions that are going to improve it because the Department is very concerned about this heavy loss on our roads. I agree that 792 people, 830 people the year previous being killed on the highways, is altogether too large a death toll and the expense and damage to property is increasing very rapidly. During the last four or five years, I am not sure of the time but I think it is four years, we have brought in for re-checking and examination some 120,000 --- I am not positive of the figure but I think it is around 122,000 people -- if a man reports to us, makes application and his eyes are so that he would not be recommended or there is some accident or something else happens or some individual reports to us, we ask that driver or applicant to come into Toronto for a special check. Then his driver's license is stamped and, of course, he is automatically checked thereafter and we are finding more and more of these each year and in that way we are checking on many of what may be termed hazardous drivers.

Now, as far as the applicants, we must first trust our people. We have a very honest class of citizen in the province of Ontario and I do not think there are many people taking a false declaration on their application. If they find their eyes are impaired they say so and then we have another examination, so we are doing quite a bit along that line.

MR. T.H. ISLEY (Waterloo South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) a few questions about licensing, that is license plates on well-drilling machines.

(TAKE "EE" FOLLOWS)

It has been drawn to my attention that in 1949 -- or that previous to 1949, the machines carrying drilling equipment were issued a license at $7.50 per year and that in 1949 they were raised to $42.00 or in the neighborhood of $42.00. This has been drawn to my attention by well drillers in the area, who feel that this is entirely too much of a fee to pay for their plates in any one year. According to the figures given to me, and they can be checked with the Department of Mines, who have those figures, they have a complete list of the wells drilled in the province and a record of the distance between the different places where these drillers are drilling -- and these drillers tell me that they make on an average of only 250 miles per year at the most. Now, this to me seems like a large fee for plates on a machine that is used so very little on our highways, especially to step it up from $7.50 to $42.00.

I understand they were increased because of some other group that came under the same category as the well drillers. I understand that other floats that were carrying heavy equipment were stepped up at the same time. Now, I do not think that there is any comparison with the well drilling machines that are only going over the roads once in maybe two weeks, and then moving probably only from one farm to the other, against these other heavy floats. I think it seems a ridiculous fee and I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) if he would not reconsider this and give those people a break -- after all, it is adding to the cost of the wells and well drilling today is costing enough without adding

any more expense -- I was wondering if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) would not reconsider setting this rate back to its former fee.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I might say to my hon. friend (Mr. Isley) that was a matter which was taken up with the well drillers or their association last year -- that is, if they have an association; I forget, but with a group of them -- and we set a rate which seemed to be agreeable to them all, which was a fee about one-third of what an ordinary truck of their weight would pay.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) if he has given any consideration to making it compulsory ror any motorist involved in a serious automobile accident to undergo a blood test -- or I do not know whether it is a blood test exactly, or a test for drunk driving. I understand now there are some reliable methods of testing the condition of a motorist when he is driving, and the statement has been made that more than 50% of serious automobile accidents on our highways are due to drunken driving. I am sure the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) would like to make a statement in connection with this.

MR. DOUCETT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I might say to my hon. friend (Mr. Temple) that it is not within my power to make it compulsory to have a blood test.

MR. TEMPLE: Not under the Highway --

MR. DOUCETT: Not within the power of the province of Ontario.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Chairman, would it be possible, though, to -- I believe that at the present time a person must give their consent to a blood test.

MR. DOUCETT: I think that is correct.

MR. THORNBERRY: It is not within the power of the province to compel them to take a blood test, but is it not within the power of the hon. Minister (Mr.Doucett) to say he would make them submit to a blood test before he would issue them a license?

MR. DOUCETT: No, not within my power at all.

MR. G. T. GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett), have you had any complaints about children driving tractors on the highways?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, we had done, and we included it in our Act last year, that in order to drive a tractor on the highway, they must be 15 years of age.

MR. GORDON: I had a gentleman phone me over the weekend and he asked me if I had an opportunity at any time to bring this before the House. He is a commercial traveller and travels a good many miles during the year, and on the road from Brantford to Port Dover, just recently, he came upon a boy 12 years old driving a tractor and last Summer at Durham he came upon a boy who had caused a slight accident and was only 13 years of age. He says it is getting quite common for farmers' sons 12 or 13 to be driving these tractors down the highway, and it is not very safe for boys of that age to be driving a machine of that kind.

MR. DOUCETT: Well, it is quite illegal for them to do it now.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): What did the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) say the age is? 15?

MR. DOUCETT: I think it is 15, offhand.

MR. ISLEY: Must they have a driver's license before they can use a tractor on a highway?

MR. DOUCETT: Oh no, it is just illegal for a boy not aged 15 to drive a tractor.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, may I ask at the outset that the hon. Minister (Mr.Doucett) continue to remain seated when he answers these questions?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BROWN: I know we appreciate he has been ill and this discussion is very interesting and very enlightening, and we also appreciate the straightforward answers that he has given to the many questions that are presented.

He asks for suggestions in connection with safety. I offered one when I was speaking on the Speech from the Throne in connection with an arrangement between the Department of Highways and the Department of Education, whereby courses can be given to the students in the school on driving. We appreciate now that young people when they are eligible for a driving license must pay, or their parents must pay, an additional amount of insurance, which I think has been due to the fact that the traffic accidents caused by those young people are greater in comparison with those of their elders. And I do sincerely believe that some form of co-operation between the Departments of Education and of Highways would be very effective.

As a matter of fact, it may be of interest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) to know that a school, or a course, is going on at the present time in the Kitchener-Waterloo Collegiate along those very lines, and that it is proving very beneficial.

Now, while I am on my feet, I was rather disappointed to hear the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) say that while he has $100,000 in his Estimates for Highway Safety, or Public Safety on the Highways, he anticipates that they will spend more than that. That is the very point that I raised in my speech in reply to the Budget, that under no circumstances should we spend more than is contained in the Budget, and certainly if we are anticipating that we are going to spend more, it should be in here. Now I do appreciate that this is a statutory item, but the same would hold true if it were an item that we were going to vote, and I am very much opposed to financial legislation by Order-in-Council. I do not think that those things should take place.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DOUCETT: Go ahead.

MR. DENNISON: No.

MR. DOUCETT: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I regret very much that this happened, but the Budget was brought in and the book printed in my absence. I had spoken to my Registrar of Motor Vehicles and said that we would have to put this item up to $150,000. How it happened I am not sure, but I suppose I shall take the responsibility. It is one of those things that happen.

I do not think it would have happened had I been here to check them before they went to press, but is one of those items. We still want to carry on our safety campaign even more in 1951 and we will have to take that money from some other vote in order to do it.

However, that is one of the items of great importance, and I must agree with my hon. friend the member from Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) that they are doing a very fine job up there and one which this Department greatly appreciates.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, I hate to upset the hon. Minister of Highways'(Mr. Doucett) faith in this Unsatisfied Judgments Fund he spoke about so glowingly but I am afraid not all the motorists of Ontario are too satisfied with it. This will make four now.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: I have before me a letter that appeared in the Toronto Evening Telegram sometime in the Fall. It is a motorist from the city of Toronto, William N. Cooke, and he refers to an accident he and his wife had on the 18th of June, 1950. He said they were sitting in a car parked by the side of a street in Toronto and another car crashed into theirs from the rear and caused $35. damage and injured his wife. He came to the Department of Highways and it was suggested--he said:

> "-------suggested I swear out a writ and if judgment was in my favor the Department would cancel his driver's license and prohibit him from driving until judgement was satisfied. I sued and the case was undefended. I was given

judgment with costs. I again interviewed a Highways official taking the certificate of judgment given me by the Division Court clerk and was informed all they could do was to cancel the license of defendant. As I failed to notify the Highways Department defendant was not going to appear in court to contest the claim so that the Department could have a representative there to verify judgment in absentia, I could not claim compensation from the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund."

He goes on with some rather harsh words about it and he finally says:

"I want drivers to know they may feel secure in knowing a fund has been created for their protection in such cases as mine, but only a lawyer can see you are reimbursed."

I think the driver hit the nail on the head. We have an Unsatisfied Judgment Fund which may protect the people who come into this province from New York State, from the U.S.A., from Quebec and Manitoba, but we want something that will protect the motorists of Ontario;,and we want something that will not be a gold mine for the insurance companies and the lawyers of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON; Now the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) may not wish to become the most popular man in Ontario --

Hon. J. W. FOOTE (Minister of Reform Institutions): He is.

MR. DENNISON: -- but if he does not become the most pupular man in Ontario, he is going to become the most popular man with the insurance companies and the lawyers. I think he should become an honorary member of the legal profession for the work he has given them and the trouble he has given the poor motorists.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. H. L. WALTERS (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, this letter is apparently along the same lines as my hon. friend's (Mr. Dennison) letter to the newspaper but I am rather hazy about it. Apparently it has to do with a collision just as mentioned there, but it is not the same people at all. It is signed by the same man, and he apparently has got some sort of a "beef" that has been hanging fire since June 23rd. He claims that he can get nowhere with his bill, although apparently he has received judgment.

To be perfectly fair about this thing -- and everybody in this House seems to want to be fair about everything, so I have got to go along, it is the custom --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WALTERS: So I am going to be perfectly fair about this, I am going to get hold of this person and see if I can get some more details, and when I do I am going to bring it to you, Mr. Minister (Mr. Doucett) and let you see it.

AN hon. MEMBER: That is the way to do it.

(TAKE "FF" FOLLOWS)

MR. DOUCETT: I may say to the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) that what he mentions is only part of the story. If the claimant involved got a judgment and then proved that the Judgment could not be collected, it is set out in hte Act what he does from there in and it will be paid. The chances are he has not done that. I would be very glad if you would send me that clipping over and I will check into it because we have not refused to pay any claim in which the Judgment was legal and properly obtained.

MR. DENNISON: Is this man right in the claim he makes that your Department requires a representative to be in court to certify the Judgment in case the case is not defended?

MR. DOUCETT: No. He was the claimant. Did he not sue for himself? If he sued he would, naturally, have to have a representative in court. Is that not so?

MR. DENNISON: Yes.

MR. DOUCETT: But, the other party did not need to have one.

MR. DENNISON: But the other party did not appear to defend the case and the plaintiff won by default. He said your department will not pay him because you have to have a man there to verify what was in that case.

I say to the hon. Minister of Highways)Mr. Doucett) you have a department over here in the East Block. I do not know how many employees are there but you know that department is actually doing a job for the insurance companies. I am wondering if the insurance

companies out of the profits they are making out of this automobile insurance should not pay this $700,000. in place of the taxpayers and that they should not pay the department which you have in Queens Park, which ticks off these motorists who are charged with careless driving. You force them into the hands of the insurance companies.

MR. DOUCETT: As long as I am Minister of Highways the insurance companies will never pay it, because we are not going to be beholden to the insurance companies.

MR. T.H. ISLEY (Waterloo South): Along the same lines, Mr. Chairman, I have a case where a man was approaching a railroad, he slowed down for the railroad and the man behind him crashed into his car doing damage to the extent of $400. and hospital bill. His wife was put in hospital. This occurred back in October. The man who was driving this car was a married man. The car belonged to the father but the boy needed a driver's license to earn his livelihood. He was found guilty of reckless driving. He was granted his license to keep on working but so far the lawyer has written that chap to try to make a settlement and he has ignored even the letter. Apparantly the latest I have on it is that he has left his employment and gone somewhere else. I do not see why a man should be held back since October and be trying to write letters and have his lawyer get in touch with the chap and that chap go on paying little or no attention to the matter. I think that is not right. I would like to see some different teeth put into this Act

so that you could bring these people to the front and get the money. If it has to come out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, all right, let us pay it out of that fund, by all means. I think the man is waiting for too long for his money.

MR. DOUCETT: That is a straight civil action. Your learned friend, the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) sitting right beside you, will tell you all about it.

MR. McEWING: It seems to be difficult, Mr. Chairman, tonight to get the questions put in the proper order. The hon. members drift off to another question so quickly it makes it difficult. I imagine the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) is finding it difficult to keep up to them.

With regard to this point which the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Isley) introduced, I would like to say I have a case in point regarding well drillers. In fact, the man involved was fined yesterday for not having a license. I would like something cleared up with respect to this matter. If that is the regulation, as the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) says, that it is about one-third, is it statutory, or have you it in the Act, or have you it in the regulations?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes. It is set the same as the others in the regulations.

MR. McEWING: Is it in a form these well drillers know about?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, they know about it.

MR. McEWING: Because he was fined by reason of

the fact he did not have a license which cost $40.

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): He just took a chance.

MR. McEWING: He had the ordinary license. A resonable amount for a license he did not object to paying but he did not want and he did not feel he was entitled to pay the excessive amount; in fact, he said he was given to understand that it would cost him over $100. according to the regulations. Evidently they do not know what the regulations are. If it is a proper regulation I think they ought to know about it and it ought to be in the regular regulations of the Department of Highways, because there is a differance of opinion as to whether it is one-third or one-half.

MR. DOUCETT: That is not foreign in the Province of Ontario because there are many people who have liceses similar which are required for certain loads. Whether they took a chance or not --

MR. McEWING: You can send me over a copy of that regulation.tomorrow?

MR. DOUCETT: I do not know whether I can send you that or not.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG: (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, you should have recognized me before, because my point covers well drillers and everyone else; in other words, it is not exclusive, but it is broad and general.

I do want to appeal to the hon. members not to jump to hasty conclusions and let me finish what I have to say because unless you do that you may unwisely conclude that I am suggesting an easing up process on drivers who are involved in accidents. I am not doing anything of the sort.

The point I want to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) and incidentally, if you are listening, in, to the hon. members of the House as a whole, though I address myself to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr.Doucett) --

MR. NIXON: You had better address yourself to the Chairman.

MR. SALSBERG: ---through you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr.Doucett) and the hon. members of the House. The point I raise is that a large number of citizens who very often have a very little means, working men, truck drivers and do on, find themselves penalized after they have had a minor accident in this way, that their insurance is forthwith cancelled after they are convicted on a minor offence, a minor accident of which almost anybody could be guilty at one time or another. Their insurance is cancelled. Their licence is then cancelled because one cannot drive a vehicle without insurance. These people are then obliged to go to the Central Bureau of the insurance companies and secure insurance at a much higher rate than is normally charged -- 20%.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that there seems to be no logic and certainly no fair play about this system. No logic, because you either decide to remove a man from the highway, drive him off of the highway, do not let him drive if he is reckless or dangerous, or you do let him drive. Obviously in the case I have in mind the person is not considered reddess, he is not a danger on the highway, he is allowed to drive on the highways of the province but the insurance companies refuse to give him insurance at normal rates and they are parties to a central

hook-up which charges 20% or more for insurance. I suggest that this is neither logical nor fair.

MR. MILLARD: A shakedown.

MR. SALSBERG: It is a shakedown, the hon. member for York West (Mr.Millard)says. I rarely use harsh terms like that.

SOME hon. MEMBERS : Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: But, since it was mentioned, I am obliged to say that I am not preparted to quarrel with the hon.member for York West (Mr. Millard) but to agree with him that it looks like a racket.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh,oh.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago, to illustrate what I mean, a young married man with a wife and two children came to see me in this building asking for help to get insurance. He earns his livelihood from the driving of trucks. He had a minor accident. He hit another car unintentionally. The damage was small, as damages go nowadays with the costs of repairs being what they are, $60. being total amount. It was paid; but the insurance company cancelled his insurance The company refused to employ him until he got other insurance. The Vehicles Branch apparently asked him to hand over his licence. There he was, jobless,unable to support his family, yet, if he were able to get insurance he could go back to work. He did not know of this Central Insurance Bureau.

I was in touch with the department. They assured me that if he went there they would see to it that he got his insurance. I imagine he got his insurance and he must have gone back to work. In the meantime the breadwinner of that family lost two weeks wages and the insurance companies will collect 20% more than they normally would. He is on the highway again, as I think he should be.

I raised this question on a previous occasion. I raise it now because it is not an insignificant matter. It is serious to the person who comes up against this problem. I do not think the insurance companies should be allowed to cancel the insurance of a driver who is involved in that sort of an accident. Certainly the government should step in and prevent the insurance companies from overcharging people to the tune of 20% because they are unfortunate enough to have had minor accidents; accidents which are not sufficient to deprive them of their rights to drive on the highways. I am sure the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr.Doucett) will agree with me and he will do something about it so that next year, if we get together again -- I mean all of us here -- I will not have to raise this question again and not burden the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) with this problem. Next year I am sure he will not have had the flu and we will not have to apologize if we are here and if he is here, of course. However, if the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr.Doucett) does not mind, I am sure the hon. members of this House would appreciate a word from him about this problem, I presume the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr.Doucett) is anxious to reply.

MR. G.B. ELLIS (Essex North): I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) with respect to the statutory amount for highway development, $31 million. I want to ask the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) with respect to the policy of the department, as to how they determine as to where new construction shall be carried out; in other words, my question in how the Department of Highways determines the policy where new construction shall be carried out. What are the factors involved in determining the need.

This year the Department has done a very excellent job on No. 2 highway up around London. The Department spent a lot of money there and they have taken out some very bad turns; but, on the same highway, not so far removed from where the department has been spending a considerable sum of money, there is one of the greatest hazards in the whole highway structure in Ontario, that is, the underpass at Ekfrid. What I am trying to determine is when we are going to spend money on new construction, rebuilding highways, why don't we spend that money where the need is greatest, where the hazards presented by the road is greatest. Definitely, insofar as No. 2 Highway is concerned, that underpass at Ekfrid should be eliminated.

What is the policy, how do we determine where this money is going to be spent and where new construction will be carried out? What are the factors involved in arriving at that expenditure in that particular area?

(TAKE "GG" FOLLOWS)

MR. SALSBERG: Would not the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) care to reply to the question I raised?

MR. DOUCETT: I might say to the hon. members that this $31,000,000. will be spent in the different divisions across the province of Ontario. It may be that our plans at the present time, with some many jobs which are laid out, will have to be held up and other work taken on. But as near as possible we will take the most urgent things and distribute them, of course, amongst the different divisions or the different counties and districts across Ontario.

MR. ELLIS: Mr. Chairman, may I follow that up by asking the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) when he intends to go ahead with the widening of that under-pass? I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) knows where it is. Many people have been killed there.

MR. DOUCETT: I might say to the hon. member (Mr. Ellis) that I think that is a matter for the Transportation Commission. There are a lot of details to do with that and we have not got the approval yet. I know the place you mean.

MR. SALSBERG: I am following up the question I raised before. I want to say in all seriousness, while I appreciate the fine spirit which prevails here this evening, I am the last person who wants to become rough, but I must insist that the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) answer the question I raised, because of its seriousness. It is a problem of great importance to hundreds, if not thousands, of motorists every year. There seems to be no justification for it and either the Department can justify its procedure or they should take some

action to remedy it. There is no reason why a truck driver who meets with a minor accident, when he backs his truck up and hits a parked car, should lose two weeks' wages and then be obliged to pay the premium to an insurance company. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) should answer without much pressure, but apparently a little more pressure is necessary and I appeal to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) to be good enough to give his opinion on that problem.

MR. DOUCETT: There might be many reasons for that. We cancel about 1,000 licenses per month, on the average. According to the Highway Traffic Act, there are certain rules and regulations which they must comply with. It is possible that this fellow who was the truck driver found his company refused to file for him, which they may, under the Act. But in the case where a company does not file, then he must do it himself or at the end of so many days he loses his license. We are fairly lenient with certain types of drivers but the Act is there and it is up to him to take care of himself from that on. We have helped to have an assigned risk plan set up, which the insurance companies have done, to take care of drivers who are unable to have their own company file for them. Then he may make application to the assigned risk plan and, if he is accepted, unless he has a terrible record, they assign him to a company and that company must issue a policy to him.

MR. MILLARD: At the regular rate or a premium rate?

MR. DOUCETT: We have nothing to do with the rates

at all. All we ask, under the Act, is that the driver who has had an accident over a certain amount, done property damage amounting to over $50., or one which involved personal injury, must file with the department a certificate to the effect that he has secured insurance to the limit of $5,000. for one person injured or killed and $10,000. for more than one.

MR. SALSBERG: Does the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) think that is a fair set-up? I am sure this might apply to any hon. member of his House. Suppose you were to operate a small business in your town and employed a truck driver or two and supposing he meets with a small accident - why should he be asked to assume a financial risk as high as $10,000.? I would not hold it against any small employer who would refuse to do that. He would want his drivers to get insured. The insurance company, as we have found out, will give him a policy at an increased premium. That is the point. That is where the unfair aspect of this whole situation comes in. I am no expert on insurance company operations but I would be the last person to demand that a body be set up to increase the charge of that insurance premium. There is no reason why I should not argue against that proposition. These accidents happen by the thousands, unintentionally, and they happen to very careful drivers as well, but here you put the small employer in a position where, if he does not assume the financial responsibility, the driver has to be let go. Of course,he lets him go. The hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) knows than an inexperienced person, when in such difficulty, begins knocking at the doors of insurance

agents and the agent says, "We will try to get insurance", but it is days, and sometimes weeks, before he knows he has to go to Queens Park and sees this set up which will assign him to secure an insurance policy, for which he will pay 20 or 25% additional premium. I am sure the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) cannot justify that in his own mind.

MR. DOUCETT: That is in the case when a man's record is bad. If you check the record, you will find he is a repeater--

MR. SALSBERG: This man is not a repeater. This is a young man who had an accident for the first time and they just cancelled it. On a former occasion, I brought this problem to the attention of the House --

MR. DOUCETT: Send that particular case over to me and I will look into it and see what the answer is.

MR. SALSBERG: I think the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) should not ask to have people sent to him. He receives hundreds of people in the course of a short time and I do not see why he should be burdened like this.

There was a case which I referred to two years ago of a merchant on the street who drove his car out in the morning from the lane and quite accidentally - he was going very slowly - a car passed on the street and did not see him coming and hit him. It was not his fault. His insurance was cancelled and weeks went by and the man was not able to drive his car.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) should not say "Send that case over to me" or he will be confronted with hundreds of people sent by hon. members from all

over the province.

What is necessary is a change in the whole procedure. If a person is a safe driver, the insurance company should give him insurance at regular rates; if he is not a safe driver, he should be kept off the highways. That would be reasonable.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I have not spoken on any of the votes in the hon. Minister's (Mr. Doucett) Department, except just before the House rose at 6 o'clock, when I invited the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) to come tonight prepared to give the government's attitude on the Report of the Transportation Commission.

Of course, most of the Report dealt with the railroads, one of which was the Ontario Railroad, and I would particularly draw the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) to one aspect upon which I think the House should receive a statement of policy from the government.

In the Telegram, there is a report dated March the 16th which appears to refer to the Turgeon Commission and its Report which came after, I believe, two years of inquiry. It says:

> "Significantly the report says that a unified Board of Control of Transport,
>
> > 'might undertake the regulation of inter-provincial and international highway transport'
>
> "This regulatio n has, until recently, been thought to be in the powers of the province. The Federal Government has not asserted its control over it, but recently intervened in a Supreme Court of Canada hearing, to say the provinces did not have such control."

The Federal government has not asserted its control over it yet and recently intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada here to say that the province did not have such control. That was the New Brunswick case, to which reference has already been made in this House.

This is a very important matter, on which I think the Government should state its policy. It is true, it is not law; it is a Report of the Royal Commission appointed by the government of Canada, but it suggests a change in the structure of the transportation system of this country and, with great respect to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett), I say he should take the House into his confidence and tell us what the government thinks about it. It is too important to be allowed to pass unnoticed.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, may I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that this is the 20th of March and the Turgeon Report was referred to quite extensively, I think, on the 16th.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is right.

MR. FROST: We have not even seen a copy of the Report. One would have to take that Report and consider it and weigh it and the fact is that part of the Turgeon Report may be premised on the New Brunswick decision which, I think, is a decision which may go to the Privy Council. I think it was a case which was started before the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council and, therefore, the law may not be settled. The fact is that the matter arose in a rather hurried way as far as we were concerned.

The New Brunswick case was decided, I think, in

some of the minor courts and went to the Supreme Court of Canada and we were only notified at the last moment. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) can see the import of such a decision. It would mean that inter-provincial traffic - that traffic which runs, say, from Toronto to Montreal - under the terms of that decision might become the subject of Federal jurisdiction. That may be the case.

In the first place, there is doubt on that point and I believe that case can go to the Privy Council.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, it has been impossible to study the implications of that case and what would be involved. As far as the Turgeon Report is concerned, I think a very prudent thing to do is to take that Report and weigh it and study it very carefully before we come to any decision on any part of it.

I will assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that the Government is not in a position to make a pronouncement on a point as important as the one he raises at the present time.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Did the government make any representation to the Turgeon Commission?

MR. DOUCETT: None at all.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This is another Commission where the provincial government stayed away? I can appreciate the situation, if the Report is not in the hands of the government, but I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) can appreciate our difficulty. I do not suppose the estimates for the hon. Minister's (Mr. Doucett) Department will be before the Legislature until the next Session and, in the meantime, we are

left in the dark as to what the government's policy is. I would suggest that, as soon as possible, the government arrive at a policy with regard to this matter.

I believe at the hearing before the Supreme Court, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) upheld the Provincial jurisdiction which, of course, is customary. I do not know whether that is done in a purely formal way, or with any great conviction, insofar as interprovincial traffic is concerned, but it seems that question will loom large in the coming year.

(TAKE "HH" FOLLOWS)

Particularly with the advent of a Trans-Canada Highway, in the real sense it will become more of a problem and not less of a problem.

Now, I will not pursue the matter of the Turgeon Report any further and I have no desire to overtax the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) but I would remind him that early in the Session I invited him to disclose to the House the present position of the government in relation to priorities. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) ought to tell us what, if any, suggestion have been made by the Federal Government with regard to postponing or the acceleration of highway construction in view of the present situation. The hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) knows what I am talking about. There are, of course, certain limitations, on construction when there are shortages of labor and materials but apart from those limitations, what suggestions have been made if any by the Federal Government about the curtailment of the present construction program because of the greater need in other fields? In other words what priorities if any have been suggested by Ottawa and what has been the response if any to those suggestions by the government of Ontario? I think it is clear if you look at the statutory item for highway construction which on paper, at least, are very large estimates. It is quite clear that highway construction represents a major proportion of our capital expenditure and it, therefore, assumes some importance in the light of expenditures which are about to be made or will be made next year for defence purposes, possibly for housing purposes and for other essential needs. I do not suggest

that Highway construction is not sometimes very essential, it sometimes is, but where does the hon. Minister (Mr.Doucett) stand in regard to this matter? It is something about which I think he should inform the House; Are you going to proceed full speed ahead along the lines you mentioned to the Good Roads Convention a year ago or is the road building program to be slowed down, and if so, how much is it to be alowed down in the light of the situation to-day?

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), I might say that we have had no suggestion from Ottawa in regard to the slowing down of our road program in any way. We have discussed with them the Trans-Canada Highway and it is true that steel will be very limited and it was only, I think, yesterday that we heard that we had to make application to the Steel Controller for steel. The amount which we are getting is very limited and, of course, we will have to curtail and probably suspend the construction of many large projects, especially where we would be getting fabricated steel and road steel too will be very very limited. However, I think that the Federal Government feel and we feel that the increase in transportation that we had last year, an increased registration of one car every minute ten hours a day and seven days a week that the registration in Ontario is going up very, very rapidly, and in order to keep abreast of the needs of this increased registration and increased travel by the vehicles that we have according to our records have increased many millions miles travel last year, that it is essential in the life of Ontario for us to try to keep abreast with this extension.

Of course, we must be able to go ahead with some types, as I have mentioned at the Ontario Good Roads Convention last year but we will be able to go into other lines on the road building that will be sort of in our over-all picture. Probably grading will be curtailed where we need a lot of bridging and steel and cement but then we can probably take other roads where we can put down pavement that has been worn out and has deteriorated throughout the years of the war and we have not got around to it. In our Estimates this year one of the items which you no doubt will have noticed is an increase for the municipalities. During the last few years the municipalities, we have tried to curtail that as much as possible and they are asking for decided increases, and, of course, there will be some money spent in that way but it is difficult to know just what field we will be able to spend in according to the supply. We intend to go along with our program as near as we can.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I take it then there is no definite plan on the priorities as yet?

MR. DOUCETT: No, that is right, not in road building. In office building, yes.

Vote 93 agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if we should consider the Milk Bill for a few moments and then go into the --

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think it would be a very good idea.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs leave to report certain resolutions and asks leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister); Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee, Mr. Patrick in the chair.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, the indulgence of the House is asked to consider Bill 129, An Act to amend the Milk Control Act. This Bill was just before the Agricultural Committee this morning and certain amendments were decided upon at that time, all of which are acceptable to the government and in fact, I might say myself personally in looking them over, I think the amednments strengthen the Bill.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Now, Mr. Chairman, I think it is desirable to pass this Bill through Committee with a view of giving the Bill third reading to-morrow and obtaining the consent of His Honour to the Bill* shortly after two o'clock tomorrow afternoon. Now, the reasons for that are very obvious, it is not necessary for me to elaborate on the desirability of that course. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would perhaps for the benefit of the hon. members here who were not at the Agricultural Committee give just a little outline of the changes in this Act.

The changes are these; first, under the Act the arbitrator was a single Judge, we discussed that before and the Committee in its wisdom decided that the Board should become the arbitrator. As the House knows, the Judge has rather a preferred position on the Committee, having not only a -- not being only a member of the Committee and having a vote but having a casting vote on the Committee as well. I might say that I think that the fact that the Board which really has to do with this matter throughout, that it strengthens the Act that the Board itself should be the arbitrator or should take the place of the arbitrator that was in the original Act.

Now, some of the other matters, there are some changes here which are rather minor. There is a new section introduced into the Act taking the place of the section relating to keeping the agreement in force. That was discussed here previously. Now, the Act as you know the agreement expired at the end of the agreed time. The section was introduced to the Act, that is in the Act, a few days ago, making the agreement continuous. Now, the Committee feel this and after hearing the representations that were made that the section providing for the continuation of the agreement was not strong enough and therefore a new section has been introduced in the Act as regards that point.

We had some discussion here in the House in relation to the repeal of section 14 and the sections which were complimentary to that in the other Act. The committee, in its wisdom, felt that that should be deleted. I myself expressed some doubts about that when the matter

was before the House and I am quite in agreement, I do not think that that provision now in the Act in connection with prices, that that is either necessary or desirable. The fact is, in the Act itself there is now the provision for setting up boudaries of districts and I do not think it is necessary to repeal section 14 or I do not think that the sections that were in the previous Act, that were complimentary to that repealed section, are necessary and accordingly, the committee has deleted them.

Now, the committee also has deleted another section about which we expressed doubt here yesterdzy and that was the section which limited the power of the Board to impose licences. I expressed doubts myself yesterday on that point, I think that the point of course was this, if the section were placed there then the purpose of that was to create ways and means to create more competition in the areas by not being too strong in the matter of issuance of license and, therefore, the B oard's powers in that regard were restricted.

(TAKE II FOLLOWS)

Now, my own feeling is that to limit the Board in that way would not really create further competition. If it did, it would be in a very limited way and I am quite satisfied that it is better that that section remain as it is and that the Board's powers remain as they are.

Now, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the hon. members of the House those are the principal changes there are in this Bill after Committee consideration and after, I think, very extensive representations were made to the Committee this morning by interested parties. I probably have covered the subject rather inadequately but in a short space of time I think that that is the gist of the changes, and they can be considered now section by section.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

On section 1.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question under section 1. It says a "Board of three arbitrators", and I understand that Mayor McCallum has been named for the consumers. I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) -- because I feel that Mayor McCallum is far too busy, far too remote from the people -- what were the factors involved in choosing him to represent the consumers. In fact, I would suggest that in the event Mayor McCallum does not see fit to accept the appointment, some outstanding personality in a trade union should be named, who would have the confidence of the people.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I am quite pleased to answer that question. After all, my hon. friend (Mr.Ellis)

knows that there are 4,500,000 consumers of milk in Ontario. I think with the increase in our population, in our Budget I said there were 4,600,000 people in Ontario, and I suppose that they are consumers of milk--or if they are not, they should be.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): And more every minute.

MR. FROST: More every minute.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I think you will agree that any government sitting here attempting to choose somebody to represent the 4,600,000 people would have [illegible] in making a unanimous choice for that position. Now, I quite agree with my hon. friend the member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) that there are many desirable --

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: -- people in this province. You have to use your best judgment. I will say that we did not choose Mr. McCallum, the Mayor of Toronto as such, because if we had been doing that, we probably would have gone to the most important municipality in the province in the eyes of my hon. friend (Mr. Ellis), Windsor, and we would perhaps have picked on the Mayor of Windsor.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: How about Lindsay?

MR. FROST: Yes, or Lindsay.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Did you choose him as ex-mayor?

AN hon. MEMBER: The Mayor of London would have "Rush"-ed it through.

MR. FROST: Mayor McCallum is the Mayor and leading citizen of the largest city, one with 700,000 people, and among that 700,000 people we certainly have not a minimum of the difficulties in this area. I have received such representations from time to time from the Toronto City Council in connection with this problem, and others in the city, and I would say to my hon. friend (Mr.Oliver) our judgment may not be 100% --

MR. OLIVER : Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: We quite agree that it is awfully difficult to satisfy 4,600,000 people but if we can satisfy the majority of them, we do a very fair job.

MR. OLIVER: I do not think you have done that,even.

MR. FROST: That is the approach we made to it, and I say that Mr. McCallum has been to see me on a couple of occasions today and that he showed every evidence of taking a very keen interest in this from the standpoint of the people of this province, and I think he will make a good representative.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St.Andrew): And besides, he is a "cowboy".

SOME hon.MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. M. C. NIXON: You asked for it.

MR. OLIVER: It is your baby.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR(Minister of Municipal Affairs): That is your best one yet, Joe, (Mr.Salsberg), you are improving.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 6.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, in Section 6, clause 1, of this Bill at the second last line you will see the word "obtained" -- the first word in the second last line of sub-section 1. I would like to move, Mr. Chairman, that after the word "obtained" be added the word "elsewhere".

I may explain to hon. members of the House that some hon. members on this side, with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), consulted with the law clerks on that point -- with Mr. McTavish -- and it was agreed that it would both strengthen and clarify the section to put in the word "elsewhere" after the word "obtained", and I so move.

Motion agreed to.

Section 6 amended as agreed to.

On Section 7.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, Section 7 is in the same form in which it appeared in the Bill introduced on Thursday of last week, and it was approved today by the Agricultural Committee and it is supported by those of us on this side of the House who are particularly interested in this question of the immediate price to be paid by consumers in a certain market. Now, it had not been my intention to speak on the Bill in Committee of the Whole House, but I do observe that in this afternoon's Press there is quite a full report of what was said in the Agricultural Committee, this afternoon on behalf of the distributors.

May I say that I think it is fair to place on record the fact that all the interested parties were given an opportunity to appear before the Agricultural

Committee. The producers were heard from and the distributors were heard from at some length. I do not think that anyone can deny that the distributors, both through their president and their counsel, received a lengthy and a courteous hearing, so that they were able to make their position abundantly clear. I do, however, take exception to the suggestion that was made on their behalf to the Committee and reported in the Press today that if there should be a milk strike in the Toronto ma et tomorrow, it will be the responsibility exclusively of hon. members of this House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not think that can be supported by the facts, by the record or by the language of this Bill. The history of this thing is that in the autumn of last year, 1950, the union, representing a majority of the employees of the dairies in the city of Toronto, entered into negotiations with the dairies, and those negotiations continued for some time, in fact for a good many months after their previous agreement had expired or reached its anniversary date. They went through the process of conciliation and a conciliation board has recently reported. The dairies state that they are willing to accept the majority report of the Board of Conciliation, which involves a certain wage increase.

On the basis of those facts, the distributors told the Committee this morning that it was essential to them to institute an increase of one cent in the price to the consumer in the Toronto area immediately, that they could not otherwise institute the wage increase

recommended by the majority report of the Board of Conciliation and that since the union was determined to get at least as much as was recommended by the majority report of the Board of Conciliation that there would probably be a strike tomorrow unless this Legislature struck out Section 7, which is now before the Committee.

But there was certain other information which we were able to obtain from the distributors' representative and that was that in the autumn of last year the dairies in Toronto i creased the price of milk to the consumers by one cent. What was done with that cent? The information their counsel gave us their morning was that approximately one-third or, according to their manager, four-tenths of a cent was used to pay an increase of $3. a week on account of labour. Taking the higher figure, four-tenths of a cent for labour, and that a third of a cent was used to pay an increase to the producer under the new agreement or award reached last autumn; those two figures do not total one cent, and it is a legend on behalf of the distributors that the difference is covered by other increases in costs, but as to those increases in costs, no particulars and no figures were given to us.

I think it is fair to conclude that as between the increase paid to labour plus the increase paid to the producers and the increase to the consumers of one cent, there was a small margin, a cushion, with which to carry the dairies forward for a few months at least.

The second chapter of this matter is that the dairies now say; "to implement the report of the Board

of Conciliation and pay a higher wage to labour will cost us approximately three-fifths of a cent". They are under no immediate obligation legally to pay more to the producers, although they should probably pay more to the producers, in my opinion, but in order to institute this increase now of three-fifths of a cent to labour, they claim it is necessary to get another cent from the consumer. Where again there is margin, again there is a cushion or a margin between the amount required for increased costs on the amount they propose to obtain from the consumer. I am not satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that it follows from the figures I have quoted -- and they are the distributors' own figures -- that it follows that they cannot do as they say they wish to do, namely, pay the recommended increase to lanour and carry on for a few weeks until such time as the newly constituted Milk Control Board can hear their case, go into the figures fully and decide on the merits whether they are actually entitled to another cent. I think that if the distributors had a better case, that they are in fact unable to pay another three-fifths of a cent to labour without getting a cent from the consumer, they could have brought much more convincing evidence before the Committee this morning.

And, Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make clear is that when the distributors begin by saying that it is the responsibility of hon. members of the Legislature if there is a strike in Toronto tomorrow, it was then incumbent upon them to prove to us beyond any doubt that it is impossible for them to institute that increase without

an extra cent.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And, Mr. Chairman, they failed to do it and having failed to do it I say that the responsibility is not ours, but theirs. This Bill is going through this House with the minimum of delay. I have no doubt that the Board as newly constituted will meet and will function with a minimum of delay.

MR. FROST: Tomorrow afternoon.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But if the distributors have a case for another cent, -- which I personally doubt but it is not for me to decide -- if they have a case for another cent they will then, in a few days time, have every facility for and every opportunity of placing their case before the Milk Control Board.

(TAKE "JJ" FOLLOWS)

I think it is not for them to say that a strike will be the responsibility of this House. I think it is for them to say that in a few days at least they will make some sacrifice in order to assure stability in their industry. I felt it necessary to say this because sometimes it is only too easy for interested parties in these disputes to say, if anything goes wrong, it is the responsibility of parliament, or it is the responsibility of the Legislature. Some of those who are so hasty in making those statements should, first of all, look at their own balance sheets.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. McEWING: There is something else that looks to me radically wrong with this Bill. Maybe it is not as bad as it look, but if you will look in this clause 1, with respect to the appointment of the Board, it just says "a Judge". Under this Bill there is no machinery to set up the Board. I take it that you are setting it up under the old Act.

MR. KENNEDY: That is right.

MR. FROST: The Act was amended.

MR. McEWING: I read: "The Board shall consist of one or more members who shall be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and shall hold office during ---". That does not say there is one of the distributors, one of the purchasers, or one of the consumers. The government can appoint who it likes. I think those groups should know definitely that they are going to be represented. The intention is all right today but there is nothing to guarantee them in future that they are going to be represented. I think there

should be some guarantee.

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): The past record guarantees it.

MR. McEWING: No.

MR. FROST: May I say, in response to what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has said, that I was not, of course, at the Committee meeting this morning, and I am not familiar with everything that was said, but I certainly am in agreement with the general tenor with what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has said. I think it is nonsense to say that this Bill will cause a strike in this city. I do not think there is anything in the Bill to cause a strike. The fact of the matter is that there is not anything really new about the principle involved in this Bill. I do not think it is necessary for anyone to infer that we have to give, of necessity, a blank cheque for certain people to price-fix themselves without any review in order to prevent these dire things happending in this city of this province.

The fact is that, as I said, there is nothing really new about the principle involved in this Bill.

At this point I would just like to say a word about the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) who sits on my right. He is the father of Milk Legislation in the Dominion of Canada. He is the man who in 1934 introduced an Act which weathered all the storms up to 1948. The fact is that we are really going back now to the principle which he devised back in 1934.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: There is not anything which is new about the principle we are trying out.

I just had the opportunity tonight of some discussion in relation to this matter with some of the members of the department of Agriculture. They have all had experience in the workings of this principle. I think this principle will work, I am satisfied it will work well. I might just say at this point sometimes statements are made by people in the heat of some stress or excitement. We all do that.

MR. MACLEOD: But you.

MR. FROST: I think it is advisable for people at this time to keep their feet on the ground. I say that to all the people in this area. Just keep your feet on the ground and do not fly off on a tangent. This is about the only real innovation in the system which was drawn up nearly twenty years ago by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy). The innovation is that the hearings are public hearings. I think that is a desirable thing. That is the only real, fundamental change in the system which we had for many years, of which he was the inventor. I think the fact that there will be public hearings is a very desirable thing. It assures John Q. Public of what is going on and he knows, and he can see, and there is the opportunity, just the same as there was in the Committee of Agriculture this morning, of people coming to present their views. I think that is a good thing. I am sure that principle is good. There are always several interests involved in these cases. The hon. Leader of the Opposition

(Mr. Jolliffe) referred to one section which said that this Act was going to cause a strike. A strike cannot be caused unless somebody goes on strike. I say to the other side, "just go easy". After all, strike action would be hardest on the consumer, the very ones whom we are all out to protect, and to whom we are going "all out" to give a square deal. Just let everyone keep his feet on the ground at the present time. This Board is a good Board. This will work things out satisfactorily. I should say that what we need at the moment is a little bit of time to work out these problems. I think we will find sailing a lot smoother as time goes along.

With respect to the objection from the hon.member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing) , I think we are taking the proper course. The section covering his objection is contained in the Act. It is announced government policy that there will be representatives of the producers, the distributors and the consumers on the Board. They will be there. They will be appointed. There is provision in this Bill, Section 2, for the Chairman of the Board to have the casting vote in case of a tie. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, it would be wise to disturb that. The hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing) cannot doubt the good faith of the government in taking this action. I think this should remain the way it is.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. McEWING: This system was drawn up, you say, twenty years ago. It is 20 years old. Those same factors possibly were not as prominent with respect to it then as they are today. It would be very simple to add that that

these other members of the Board are entitled to some guarantee that they are going to be continually represented.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): Does the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) expect to have the Board completed as to personnel tomorrow afternoon?

MR. FROST: I should tell the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) that the Board will meet in Committee Room No. 1 tomorrow afternoon at 3:00 o'clock, that is, assuming third reading is given to this Bill and that assent is given.

MR. MILLARD: Do we know the names of the other members of the Board?

MR. KENNEDY: The members of the Board are Judge Currie, "Ken". Betezner of Waterloo, representing the farmers, Morris Hart, of Oshawa, representing the distributors, and Mr. McCallum, representing the consumers. It is the same Board we have had, with the addition of the consumer representative.

Sections 7, 8 and 9, inclusive, agreed to.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Bill No. 129 reported.

MR. FROST: I move that the Committee rise and report a certain Bill with amendment.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes (Mr. Speaker in the Chair).

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Whole begs to report a certain Bill with amendment and moves adoption of the Report.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr.Speaker, before making a motion that you do now leave the Chair, I would like to make this suggestion to the House, that in the ext estimate considered, we ask the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) to leave his seat and occupy the end seat where he is closer to the floor. My purpose in doing that is that we do not want to keep page boys here --

MR. McEWING: Let the Deputy sit beside him.

MR. FROST: We can let the paige boys go. It avoids the maintaining of a messenger service and saves a lot of time, if that would meet with the approval of the House. With that understanding I will move, Mr. Speaker, that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee of Supply (Mr. Stewart in the Chair)

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Page 43, Department of Health, Vote 55.

Hon. M. PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, during the Throne Speech Debate, I tried to give this House a picture of the Department of Health. At this time I would like first to pay tribute to the thousands of public spirited men and women in this province who have given of their time, of their efforts and talents towards the welfare of our general hospitals. Our public hospitals have found it most difficult in the last few years. They have been faced with ever increasing costs. May I say that only a few years ago the statutory responsibility of the Provincial Government towards general

hospitals represented only about one-third of the amount that the municipalities had to pay.

(TAKE "KK" FOLLOWS)

KK-1

Since last year -- or in the year 1950 -- the Provincial government gave a regular grant to public hospitals of $6,300,000. They also gave a supplementary grant, which was based on the indigent patient-day of almost one and one-half million dollars, making a total of over seven and one-half million dollars. The municipalities gave a grant, which was statutory, of three and one-quarter million dollars.

I also want to say that the municipalities paid as well the sum of two million dollars, and I certainly want to give credit to all the municipalities throughout this province for giving this amount toward the deficits of our hospitals, and remember, that is only for maintenance. Besides this, our municipalities went all out in capital expenditures, in any municipalities where they either build a new hospital or added an extension to their present one.

I would like very much to thank the many hon. members of this House, first, for the fact that they realize that the Department of Health is a privileged Department; secondly, for their many kind remarks to me personally, and also for their many suggestion, and may I say, for offering constructive criticism which I took in a spirit of good faith, and I know they were sincere in their efforts to be helpful, and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that if any hon. member of this House would like any information at all regarding my Department, I would be very happy to try and secure it for him.

March 20th, 1951.

KK-2

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr.Jolliffe) and also other hon. members of the House have criticized the government with regard to the shortage of hospital beds, and I would like at this time to give you a little picture of the hospital bed situation today as compared with it five years ago.

First of all, take the mental hospital beds. Following the war, we were able to get back the hospital at St.Thomas. We build a new addition at Orillia, a new hospital at Aurora, a part of a new hospital at Smith's Falls, and at the present time, we have one under construction at Port Arthur. Under present plans, when this construction is completed, we will have another 465 beds at the head of the Lakes. Then we hope to go on and make 1,000 beds, but under our present construction scheme, it will give us 465 beds, which will provide beds for both men and women. As you may know, the present accommodation at both Port Arthur and Fort William is for male patients only, and female patients have to be transported to some hospital, most of them coming to New Toronto.

At the present time, we have 17,000 beds in our mental hospitals. We have 500 boarding out, and we have about 1500 on probation, and we have a back-log of patients numbering 2,200. To give you the additional mental beds, added since 1945, we have added 300 at Orillia, 1800 at St.Thomas, 250 at Aurora, and we are working on Smith's Falls, and we hope before too long to have at least 450 patients there, and probably 700 by the end of this year.

Now, regarding our public or general hospitals. If we look at our hospitals in 1944, we find that at that time we had a great surplus of beds, but there have been a great number of changes which have taken place, which is probably the main reason why we need more beds, and have needed more beds, since the war. We may put these changes down first, to modern treatment, and, secondly to the Blue Cross and all other allied hospitalization schemes.

The building or construction of hospitals is really a municipal responsibility, or, may I say, a community responsibility. For the last few years, the Department of Health has given encouragement to municipalities to go ahead with building programs, and if the hospital which they expect to build is at all in line with the regulations provided by the Department of Health, I can say that we have not stopped one single project. As a matter of fact, there might be some here who would be in disagreement with that statement. I would like to say that it is foolish to allow a municipality, for instance, to go ahead and build a hospital with major facilities, when they can get along very well with minor facilities. I want to say to this House that no municipality or community which builds a hospital can afford for a minute to have a mortgage on that hospital when it is finished, for the simple reason that it will take all the financial effort of the community, plus the assistance from the province to finance the operating costs, without any back-log of monies owing on capital expenditures.

Now, from 1945 to 1952 -- or, we will say when all the hospitals are finished which have already been approved by the Department of Health -- we will have a total of approximately 12,000 beds. 3,000 of those are replacements, and we will then have in this province 27,000 beds, which will be 6.14 bed per 1,000 population, taking the population as it is at the present time. This also includes convalescent and chronic accommodations. Our capital commitments for this program has amounted to $14,000,000. and we have already paid over one-half of this commitment.

I would like for a moment to compare the province of Ontario in population with that, of, say, Saskatchewan, in the last 10 years. In 1939, the population of Ontario was 3,708,000; in 1949, it was 4,411,000, or an increase of 703,000 people -- almost three-quarters of a million.

The population in Saskatchewan in 1939 was 906,000; in 1949, it was 861,000, or a decrease of 45,000. I do not think that I have anything more to say to the House for them to realize that with a population which has been increasing at the rate Ontario has, averaging 140,000 people per year, against a province where the population has been going down, that we have to build many beds to keep up with the normal increase in our population.

I would also like to say a word in regard to the statistics quoted by the hon. member for St.David (Mr. Dennison) and may I say that it is most difficult to get dependable information. I know you will all agree with me it is very difficult to get statistics. No matter

how hard you try, if you get one group of statisticians, they will not agree with another group, and probably each group has tried their best to show a true picture. This is true with regard to the prepaid hospitalization, and medical plan, and I was very interested, and I know the hon. member for St.David (Mr. Dennison) was also, in the fact that in the year 1950, under the pre-payment plan, which takes in voluntary, commercial and governmental, we had 3,846,047 patients, that is over three and three-quarter million of a population of four and a half million, who belong to some form of prepaid plan, whether hospitalization or medical. I realize that in these figures there are duplications; many persons carry more than one type of coverage, nevertheless, these figures are very interesting.

MR. DENNISON: I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) has a break-down on this?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, I have, and I will give it to you later, if you wish. I do not think that anyone in this House will dispute the fact that the hon. member for Bellwoods has a real knowledge of higher education, and I just wondered how serious he was the other day when he spoke of "psychologists" and "psychiatrists". This is very simple to medical people, but probably the laity which are not dealing in medical terms may not be so familiar with it, and for that reason I would like to give you a little picture of what "psychologist" and "psychiatrist" are.

A psychologist is a student who takes three or four years at the University, gets his B.A., and the main

subject of his courses is psychology, which means study of the normal mind, and he is a full graduate when he receives his B.A. degree.

Now, a psychologist only takes three or four years.

Then, let us look at the psychiatrist. In our terminology, the term "psychiatrist" comprises medical and specialized groups, one, two or three.

To become a psychologist in anyone of these three groups, first of all, you have to graduate from a Medical School which, on the average, takes 6 years. Then you have to take one year's routine service in a General Hospital, and then you follow this with four years in a psychiatric hospital, and of the four years, two years are in academic work, and two years practical.

(TAKE "LL" FOLLOWS)

That means that a person before he is a certified psychiatrist has to spend six years plus five years, or eleven years.

MR. MacLEOD: Is not that exactly what I said?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I just do not remember.

MR. MacLEOD: You will find it on Hansard, I repeated word for word what you said -- you are repeating what I said.

MR. PHILLIPS: I would say to the hon. member (Mr.MacLeod) you asked me if there was any difference between a "psychologist" and a "psychiatrist". That is what I understood.

MR. MacLEOD: I know the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) wants to be fair and I know he is not attributing to me any foolish statement but what I said was that I could not find a psychiatrist listed in the schedule placed on Hansard by the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) and I said, facetiously, that possibly one should use the term psychologist and psychiatrist interchangeably. That is what I said and you naturally tripped me up on it. I was trying to see how your condition reflexes were working.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I am sorry. Now there is no doubt about the fact that we are today lacking sufficient psychiatrists, and in order to induce medical students to take this course we pay them for their last four years of study. We pay, for the first year, $4240.00, the second year $200.00 more, the third year another $200.00 and the fourth year another $200.00, so we feel that is quite an inducement. But, probably within a group of medical students there are very few of those students who are fit for this type of work. I would like to say to the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr.MacLeod), for his information, that there are two groups of physicians, the one we call the first group. Group one we call "physicians". They simply have a diploma, plus experience, but the medical specialists are really the psychiatrists and today their salary runs from a

minimum of $6000.00 up.

I know the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) is very interested in research and treatment of mental patients because I have heard him speak on it this year and in previous years. I can say to him that I am just as interested as he is and we have already given Professor Stokes, who is the Professor of Psychiatry in the University of Toronto, the right to go ahead and get us three men who are highly qualified and who should be excellent men to lead a research program. As a matter of fact, Doctor Stokes told me he expects to get two of these men from England and one from the United States, so I am very anxious to see that they do go forward with a good research program.

Well now, I have just one other thing to say here and that is regarding capital grants for hospitals. You all know that in the last few years we have been getting $1000.00 for acute hospital beds and the Federal Government has been doing the same. Now, I would like to make an announcement at this time which I think will please the people of Ontario. We are going ahead with this whether we receive assistance or not from the Federal Government and that is, that we are now ready to pay $1000.00 a bed towards nurses' residences.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, year.

MR. PHILLIPS: And that will cover all nurses' residences now under construction, as well as those in the future.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, I was hoping when the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) made his speech that he might announce that the government were prepared to take over the old Sick Children's Hospital and use it as an additional hospital in this area, which is so short of accommodation.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might clear that point up for the hon. member (Mr. Dennison). At this hour I did not intend to say anything. The Hospital for Sick Children did not want their building any longer and they put it up for sale. We purchased that building, after consultation with the Department of Public Works, for two reasons. First, in order that we could save that site for the Toronto General Hospital; secondly, so we could use certain portions of the building at the present time for the Department of Health. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) intends to take certain of the offices, at 999 Queen Street and move them up to the former Hospital for Sick Children and increase the space for beds at 999 Queen Street, which will relieve some of the difficulty there. Furthermore, the Red Cross will have that for blood bank purposes themselves.

Now as far as the Toronto General Hospital is concerned, it is out intention to give the site of the Hospital for Sick Children to the Toronto General Hospital. I have a letter here dated February 13, from Mr. Urquhart, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Toronto General Hospital, which says:

"The Honourable Leslie M. Frost,
Prime Minister of Ontario,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Frost:

Following my conversation with you concerning the site of the old Hospital for Sick Children, the building which is now being vacated by the above hospital in moving into their fine new building, I would like to make the following comments;-

I am pleased that the Province of Ontario has purchased this site, and the buildings thereon, from the Hospital for Sick Children when they expressed their desire to sell them. I understand that the Government will occupy the buildings temporarily as office space during the present period of material shortages which prevents the Government from going ahead with other of its building plans.

As you very well know, the Toronto General Hospital must extend and modernize the present hospital plant and have made plans with that view. These plans include the extension of nurses' residence, women's building, eye hospital, etc. We were very concerned that this site would be allowed to pass into the hands of commercial or other interests, so we view with satisfaction the acquiring of this building by the Government.

We have no use for the present building. The same has long been outmoded for hospital purposes and if the Government can use the same for office accommodation during the present shortage, we think it would be making good use of available space.

We would like, however, to have the assurance from you that we may have this site when the Government proceeds with its plan for providing new space elsewhere and we are in a position to proceed with some of our plans. As stated, the site is very essential for the expansion of the Toronto General Hospital.

Many thanks for your courtesies, I am, "

Mr. Chairman, in response to that letter, we have given assurance to the Toronto General Hospital that we will give them that building site with all of the buildings, and there is quite a good nurses' residence which is to be used, I think, by the Hospital for Sick Children for five years. However, we are going to give it all to the Toronto General Hospital. They do not want the building at the present time. Last night I was very interested in listening to a broadcast, and which, I would say, that twelve of the thirteen minutes consisted of incidents in which the present government had allegedly stolen the planks from another Party. It was quite interesting. There was a reference to the Hospital for Sick Children. I want to assure the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) that the Toronto General Hospital does not want to use the present Hospital for Sick Children and they have told us in this letter that they do not want it. We asked the Hospital for Sick Children if they could use it under certain conditions but they did not want the building at all, and they decided to put it up for sale, and we bought it. We paid them $375,000 for the building in order to keep the site for the Toronto General Hospital and we are going to give it to them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Y ou mean for a site, not the building?

MR. FROST: No, we paid that for "the works", -- for everything. We gave to the Hospital for Sick Children their price which was $375,000 for the buildings and the site.

MR. DENNISON: Does that property extend right to Bay Street?

MR. FROST: No, it does not. We are going to give that, as I say, to the Toronto General Hospital and their buildings can be extended over there in due course. I think that explains the situation satisfactorily and I might say the Toronto General Hospital does not want the present building. It has no use for it. They do not want to occupy it, and they are not ready yet to extend their

premises.

MR. DOUCETT: I might say to the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison), do not forget that the Hospital just splken of has the copyright on the use of it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I would not quarrel about that. Is not this the point, that the old building of the Hospital for Sick Children is highly unacceptable for a hospital by any modern standard and I think any suggestion that it should be used as a hospital or an extension of the Toronto General Hospital, except under the most pressing circumstances, would be inexcusable and I am glad to hear the site is being acquired for the purposes of the Toronto General Hospital, and if they should need an extension in the future, that is about the only direction they can go unless they want to be in the middle of University Avenue. With that I am heartily in accord, subject to this, that I have grave doubts and reservations about the policy of concentrating hospitals in an area such as we have in Toronto. I think as a long-range point of view, it is a highly questionable policy. I know there are conditions of finance and so on, but to place so many of our hospitals within one square mile or less in the midst of some of the heaviest traffic in Canada, and in the midst of what will always be perhaps a "smog" condition or, in any event, less favorable atmospheric conditions than you would get outside, and in a place which would be highly vulnerable in the event that you ever had to use a civil defence organization, I think it is a very questionable policy. We have gone so far with it, I suppose it is too late to turn back but personally, I regret very much it happened that way.

MR. [illegible]OST: I might say I am in general agreement with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) but it is very difficult to do anything about it. We have that same problem in connection with the Wellesley Hospital. As you know, the Wellesley Hospital has

been brought under the Toronto General Hospital for administration purposes. The great difficulty is the matter of transportation for the staff. Now that is one of the reasons for using Wellesley Hospital in connection with the new cancer clinic. We are building a nurses' residence there to overcome part of that difficulty. It is a difficult thing to travel to some of these places outside of the centres of the cities.

(TAKE "MM" FOLLOWS)

I may say that is another problem of the Toronto University. I often think that it is too bad that Toronto University is not out about as far as Thornhill.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, you see, they thought it was when they built it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: That is right. It is too bad that it is in downtown Toronto. It was on the outskirts at one time. It is very difficult to overcome that, either in residences or buildings. We are pretty well committed, but I suppose that is the way things have got to be.

MR. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, I am very well pleased to hear that explanation by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost). I think it is a logical move. I hope he does not imply that the broadcast was made by any member of the official opposition.

I would like now to say this generally in regard to the Department of Health. The hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) I think is doing his best to keep abreast of the expanding immigration into this province, and the birth rate in this province, which is increasing our population, as he says, at the rate of 140 some thousand people per year. But in giving us figures of General Hospital beds, and in making a statement that when the present building programme is finished we will have a 6.4 beds per thousand of population, he also has to consider the possible increase, the continuing increase of that population, so that instead of being 6.4, I am doubtful if it will be much more than 5.5, because looking at the past history of our effort to keep abreast of our need for more hospital beds in the General Hospital, in 1945 we had 4.12 and now in 1950 we only have 4.28, an increase from 4.12 to 4.28 beds per thousand people. So it seems to me we have to undertake an even greater effort, an even

greater construction of hospital beds if we are going to keep abreast of this expanding population.

I noticed in the Department of Education Estimates the other evening, and this affects the Department of Health, we were giving a grant to the University of Ottawa in regard to their medical school, and we did last year in regard to their medical school but I do not see any grants earmarked to any University yet to expand a dental school. It is quite possible that by the time we have this medical school at Ottawa in full-fledged operation we still may be in a position where even the Toronto Medical School and the Ottawa Medical School will not be able to fulfil the demand, and the Dental School is not fulfilling the demand for dentists, so I would again draw the hon. Minister's (Mr. Phillips) attention to that very obvious shortcoming.

I also noticed a rather amazing item in the Auditors' report for the year ending March 31st, 1950. I am sure this will interest the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown). I see he is not in his seat, but it refers to appropriations, and then on top of that Treasury Board Minutes, but the Department that year appropriate $500,000. -- this was in connection with the Federal H ealth grant -- and the Treasury Board Minutes added another $450,000. to the $500,000., making a total of $950,000. And out of the $950,000. -- almost a million dollars -- only $5,662,000. were spent. What a cushion there. Y ou talk about "cushions", that is the financial cushion to end all cushions, is it not?

Now, the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) may be able to explain why that was, but it seems to me rather bad budgeting.

I would like also to draw his attention to the fact that in the last issue of the Public Accounts there is $15,781,000. listed as capital expenditures on page D-12. Now that apparently refers to

maintenance grants to hospitals, plus building grants. It seems to me rather bad policy to list maintenance grants -- there might be some reason to list building grants under capital expenditures, but I do not think the province has anything to show for those capital expenditures; the hospital has, but the province has not -- it seems to me to be rather bad bookkeeping to list even building grants under that heading, but why should maintenance grants made to hospitals be put down under capital expenditure of the province and listed as an asset? It is true, as I say, they could be listed as assets for the hospital involved, but I do not think they are assets for the province in the real term of a provincial Asset.

I notice there was an item under provision for taxes in the Auditors' Report $10,000., and none spent.

Hon. M. PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) would he mind giving me the Vote he is referring to, or would it not be better to take the Cote and when we come down to the different matters he is speaking of, we will discuss it then.

MR. DENNISON: Y es, now this is under Vote 55, under Health Grants.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. DENNISON: Operating funds.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes. Well, could we not go along and start at the first and work down?

MR. DENNISON: Well, this is the first one, Mr. Minister (Mr. Phillips). 55 is the first Vote in your Estimates.

Hon. H.R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): It has not been called yet.

MR. DENNISON: Oh, yes.

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York West): It was called by the Chairman. That is when you were asleep.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, it is a little after eleven o'clock and we have a heavy day tomorrow. I would like to arrive at a point here wher we can finish for the night.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): That is a good point.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Might I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) if we can agree to take, say, item 55, get through item 55, and then we will call it a day.

MR. W.H. TEMPLE (High Park): Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I do not want to get into a further discussion. I think we might try to get to a point here where we can stop.

MR. DENNISON: Yes. I will be very pleased to assist the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) in doing that, Mr. Chairman.

Now, under the Head Office, under the Supply Bill in the last Public Accounts I again notice $24,000,000. in the Estimates; add to that $1,364,000. of Treasury Board Minutes; but you had a surplus of $1,533,000., which meant some transfer of appropriations in the Department would have eliminated the necessity for any reference to the Treasury Board in that connection.

MR. PHILLIPS: Are you still speaking about the Federal Health grant?

MR. DENNISON: No, I am speaking about your Head Office, Vote 55, your main office.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, 55 what? One?

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Item one.

MR. DENNISON: Your entire appropriation. 55 is the only place where we can speak of your entire appropriation. That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman. I will be very pleased to move the adjournment of the debate, if ---

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Vote 55 agreed to.

MR. MacLEOD: That is 55, that finishes it off.

MR. J.G. BROWN (Waterloo North): That is all.

MR. FROST: Well, does that complete 55?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. FROST: Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T.L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions, moves their adoption and begs leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the House would like to know about tomorrow. We will of course proceed with third readings and will have His Honour here to assent to the Milk Bill. And then for a short time we can go ahead with the Bills on the Order Paper, some I think we can put through committee stage and clear up the Order Paper.

With reference to Estimates, Health, Public Works, Travel and Publicity, Labour, Insurance and Attorney General. That is a very ambitious programme that we are going to try to complete tomorrow. I would like if we can, Mr. Speaker, to cover as much of this detail here if we can tomorrow. Perhaps hon. members might not object to sitting an extra hour tomorrow night due to the fact that we have a recess of five days. On the other hand, if we can close at eleven I would prefer to do that. I would like to cover as much of this as we can, because we have, as everyone knows, some important Bills to which the House would like to give attention the week following. I think we might try and do the best we can to get these Estimates cleared up as far as we can.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) mind naming those departments again? I mean for tomorrow night.

MR. FROST: Well, if you start from the top, Attorney General, Health -- Health of course will come first -- Insurance, Labour, Public Works, Travel and Publicity.

AN hon. MEMBER: All tomorrow?

MR. FROST: Well, actually speaking they could be covered quite easily in that period of time. There are questions and answers that could be ---

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) or the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) would mind tomorrow enlarging on the statement that appears in this morning's Globe and Mail?

AN hon. MEMBER: Tomorrow morning's?

MR. MILLARD: In tomorrow morning's Globe and Mail, on the front page.

(TAKE "NN" FOLLOWS)

There is a statement regarding policy on which I would like a little enlargement, particularly in regard to banquet permits.

MR. MacLEOD: Before you put the motion to adjourn, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) what the prospects are for getting a few more answers to a few more questions.

MR. FROST: I will give a statement on that tomorrow, if possible. The fact is that if we had the answers with respect to questions relating to advertising actually speaking we would be in a very fair shape as far as questions are concerned. Those questions with respect to advertising take an enormous amount of time and energy to answer. I think it is quite impossible to get the answers to those questions for several weeks. We will have to make an order for return. I thought perhaps we might get those who asked the questions and see if we could not satisfy their curiosity without putting the staffs to the labour of getting the answers to those questions. If we had those answers we would be in a fair position, as I have said. The answers to those questions take a lot of time and actually really hundreds of employees. We have discussed that in all of the Departments. That involves a tremendous amount of labour. I will have, perhaps, a summary I can give and we will do our best to give these answers.

MR. MACLEOD: I have a question on there, question number 57. You tabled the answer to it in the early days of the Session, but the answer never appeared and the question remains on the Order Paper. I have never had the answer to it. I wondered why you found it possible to give that.

MR. FROST: What question is that?

MR. MacLEOD: Question number 57.

Hon. H.R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): That is a question which had to be referred to two divisions of the Department. It was split accordingly. One division sent in the answer without

noticing the other division's answer was not attached. That is why it was withdrawn.

MR. M cLEOD: It was a split infinitive.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.18 of the clock p. m.